

# THE CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

---

No. CC.]

AUGUST, 1861.

[Vol. XVII.]

---

## BUCKLE'S HISTORY OF CIVILIZATION.\*

IN commencing the task of reviewing Mr. Buckle's second volume, we must premise, that we do not admit that he has, in his former volume, established the propositions which he considers the basis of civilization. We state this at once, because what we have to say hereafter, may perhaps appear to be inconsistent with some of those propositions; and because there is another element of civilization which appears to us more important than any of those on which the author lays so much stress.

The second volume is marked by the same marvellous extent of learning, and the same clear and vigorous style which characterized the first. Its subjects are Spain and Scotland; the first of which extends to little more than a fourth part of the volume, and the far more important subject of Scotland fills the remainder.

Superstition, which is a leading characteristic of the Spanish character, he attributes, in conformity to the views given in the first volume, in a great degree to the physical peculiarities of the country. He considers the enormous power of the clergy, which has exerted a most powerful influence on the Spanish nation, to have originated in the time of the Visigoths, when the Arian controversy was in full vigour. The invasion of the Moors, and their conquest of by far the larger portion of Spain, he considers eminently favourable to the power of the clergy; as the war between the Spaniards and the Moors, which lasted nearly eight hundred years, was as well a war for religion as for territory. After the expulsion of the Moors, the Emperor Charles the Fifth, and his son, Philip the Second, had not only to defend Christianity against the Mahometans, but had the additional work thrown upon them of supporting the Church of Rome against the Protestants, and of using their best endeavours to put down and exterminate the latter. Mr. Buckle thinks that the influence of the clergy was greatly increased by the decrease of the power of the Crown in the reigns of the weak sovereigns who followed Philip II. The power of the Church, and the respect in which the clergy were held, attracted the men of genius who adorned the literature of their country to become members

---

\* Buckle's History of Civilization in England. Vol. II.

of the clerical body; and Cervantes, Lope de Vega, Calderon, and many others of the best Spanish authors, are among the number. "Calderon was chaplain to Philip IV.; and so fanatical are the sentiments which tarnish his brilliant genius, that he has been termed the poet of the Inquisition" (p. 51). The cruel banishment of the Moriscos, which was most disastrous to the agriculture and the manufactures of the country, tended still further to exalt the power of the clergy.

After the accession of the Bourbon family to the throne of Spain, although the government was unduly influenced by France, the door was opened to many improvements; and ecclesiastical power was lessened. Still all classes in Spain were in a state of deplorable ignorance. "The Duke de Saint Simon, who, in 1721 and 1722, was the French ambassador at Madrid, sums up his observations by the remark, that 'in Spain science is a crime and ignorance a virtue'" (p. 93).

"When, in the year 1760, some bold men in the government proposed that the streets of Madrid should be cleansed, so daring a suggestion excited general anger. Not only the vulgar, but even those who were called educated, were loud in their censure. The medical profession, as the guardians of the public health, were desired by the government to give their opinion. This they had no difficulty in doing. They had no doubt that the dirt ought to remain. To remove it, was a new experiment, and of new experiments it was impossible to foresee the issue. Their fathers having lived in the midst of it, why should they not do the same? Their fathers were wise men, and must have had good reasons for their conduct. Even the smell, of which some persons complained, was most likely wholesome; for, the air being sharp and piercing, it was extremely probable that bad smells made the atmosphere heavy, and in that way deprived it of some of its injurious properties." Pp. 94, 95.

A curious instance is given of the ignorance of the Spanish nation. They possessed a famous mine of quicksilver at Almaden in La Mancha, but the produce had been for some time diminishing.

"Under these circumstances, the Spanish government, fearing that so important a source of wealth might altogether perish, determined to institute an inquiry into the manner in which the mine was worked. As, however, no Spaniard possessed the knowledge requisite for such an investigation, the advisers of the Crown were obliged to call on foreigners to help them. In 1752, an Irish naturalist, named Bowles, was commissioned to visit Almaden, and ascertain the cause of the failure. He found that the miners had acquired a habit of sinking their shafts perpendicularly, instead of following the direction of the vein. So absurd a process was quite sufficient to account for their want of success; and Bowles reported to the government, that if a shaft were to be sunk obliquely, the mine would, no doubt, again be productive. The government approved of the suggestion, and ordered it to be carried into effect. But the Spanish miners were too tenacious of their old customs to give



way. They sank their shafts in the same manner as their fathers had done, and what their fathers had done must be right. The result was, that the mine had to be taken out of their hands; but as Spain could supply no other labourers, it was necessary to send to Germany for fresh ones. After their arrival, matters improved rapidly."—Pp. 102, 103.

During the reign of the earlier Bourbon kings, the administration of public affairs was placed in the hands of foreigners; and to that circumstance our author, we think rightly, imputes the improved state of things in Spain. The ecclesiastical power was considerably diminished; and that detestable tribunal, the Inquisition, was obliged greatly to relax its horrid and execrable persecutions. "Instead of extirpating unbelievers by hundreds or by thousands, it was reduced to such pitiful straits that, between 1746 and 1759, it was only able to burn ten persons, and between 1759 and 1788, only four persons" (p. 109). Still even within this period the expulsion of the Jesuits from Spain was conducted with great injustice and cruelty. The greatest reformer who has occupied the Spanish throne was Charles III., who reigned from 1759 to 1788. Mr. Buckle gives him credit for good intentions; but he thinks that his reforms were premature, the character of the people not having been prepared for them. "To seek to change opinions by law," he says, "is worse than futile. It not only fails, but it causes a reaction, which leaves the opinions stronger than ever. First alter the opinion, and then you may alter the law" (p. 115). We cannot help thinking that this is carrying matters too far. Legislators and reformers of all sorts should no doubt be very cautious not to interfere too far with the errors and prejudices of the people; and the reaction mentioned above is pretty sure to arise in the event of their so acting; but surely laws may be adapted to the circumstances of the times and the character of the people, and may, nevertheless, be well adapted to improve that character. This we take to be the case of all wise legislation. We think that the wise laws of our Edward I. could not fail to improve the character of the people. In the reign of William III., it seems almost certain that the great majority of the people were not so freed from bigotry and intolerance as to approve of the Toleration Act; yet we think that the enacting of that law must have tended to diminish bigotry, and to that extent to improve the character of the people. If, indeed, the legislature of that period, instead of that law, had passed one giving equal rights to all, without regard to their particular religious opinions, it would probably have gone too far ahead of public opinion, and the law would have produced more evil than good.

The rule of the Bourbon princes, to the death of Charles III., is represented as an era of regularly advancing improvement. With the reign of Charles IV. the reaction commenced.

"In less than five years, everything was changed. The power of

the Church was restored; the slightest approach towards free discussion was forbidden; old and arbitrary principles, which had not been heard of since the seventeenth century, were revived; the priests re-assumed their former importance; literary men were intimidated and literature was discouraged; while the Inquisition, suddenly starting up afresh, displayed an energy which caused its enemies to tremble, and proved that all the attempts which had been made to weaken it, had been unable to impair its vigour or to daunt its ancient spirit."—Pp. 132, 133.

We have now approached the period of the French Revolution; since which the history of Spain has been so much connected with that of our own country, as to make it pretty well known to every Englishman tolerably conversant with history, and it would be useless to go into it here.

"General causes," says the author, "eventually triumph over every obstacle." This may, perhaps, be true; but that very much indeed of human affairs has been largely influenced by the actions of particular individuals, we think the history of the world gives ample proof. The character of the Athenians seems to have been in some degree moulded by the laws of Solon; and that of Sparta, far more by the institutions of Lycurgus. The conquests of Alexander laid the foundations of several kingdoms which lasted for a long period. The Roman republic was probably by its corrupt character doomed to fall, and an arbitrary government would have taken its place; but the particular character of the imperial power, which arose on the dissolution of the republic seems, in no small degree, to have been derived from the personal character of Julius Cæsar; and down to the beginning of the present century, an empire remained, which professed to be the successor of that which he established, and even his *name* was used as a title of the emperor. Charlemagne established a new era in Europe. It was mainly by the personal character of Frederick II. that a small kingdom in Germany advanced to a degree of power exceeding, so far as Germany alone is concerned, that of the Austrian family who had for many generations held the empire which exercised authority over all the German princes. Napoleon changed the whole aspect of things in Europe; subjugated old monarchies, and established new ones in subjection to himself; and although his power was ultimately destroyed, and he was doomed to end his days in a remote island, far away from the nations which he had ruled, yet there has been a revival of his empire in our days, and his nephew is at this moment one of the two greatest sovereigns of the world; and such is the extent of his power, that all eyes are turned upon him to watch his least movement. In the great and glorious struggle which has led to the establishment of the new kingdom of Italy, it is impossible not to see that the exertions of two individuals, Cavour and Garibaldi, have been the immediate cause of the happy change, although no doubt the Italians were



prepared for it. It appears to be the opinion even of many French military men, that if the allies had been ably commanded in the year 1793, they would have defeated the French and taken Paris. A Marlborough, an Eugene or a Wellington, at the head of the allied army, might have completely changed the condition of France, and of a large portion of Europe. All impute our wonderful success in war at the latter end of the reign of George II. to the ability and energy of the elder Pitt, by whom the war arrangements of the country were directed. Our wonderful dominion in India may be traced, in a great degree, to Clive, that great man who, emerging from the counting-house, came out at once a great general, resembling less any fact of history than the mythology of Minerva springing armed *cap-à-pie* from Jupiter's head. Who shall presume to say what might have been the termination of the contest in Spain and Portugal, if we had not happily had Wellington as our general? We are far from pretending to assert that any of these great men could have effected what they did, unless the state of the country in which they lived had been favourable to them; but it seems to us, that the men were as necessary to the times as the times to the men, and that the great events in the history of the world have been, for the most part, the result of great men being placed in situations favourable for the successful exertions of their abilities.

We finish what we have to say of Spain with a single observation. Whatever may be said of the better part of the character of the Spaniards, no nation in the Christian world has been guilty, on an extensive scale, of such atrocious acts of cruelty as Spain. The detestable Inquisition has in no other country, Portugal perhaps excepted, exercised such unrelenting cruelty. Accounts of the barbarous conduct of the Spanish soldiers in Italy may be found in Sismondi's admirable History of the Italian Republics. The conquests of the Spaniards in America is the blackest volume in the history of the Christian world; and perhaps the very blackest page of it is the atrocious persecution, and in a short time the absolute extermination, of the innocent, virtuous and interesting inhabitants of Hispaniola.\* With such a people we are glad to have no more to do, and we now pass on to the far more interesting portion of the volume before us.

We think the history of Scotland is too well known to the far greater portion of our readers to require us to enter into it here; and to do so, would lead us to extend this article,—which we fear, in spite of our endeavours to make it as concise as we can, will be much longer than we wish it to be,—to an unreasonable and fatiguing length.

The power exercised by the Presbyterian clergy in Scotland

---

\* See a most interesting account of the inhabitants of Hispaniola, by Columbus, in Lamartine's Life of Columbus, Vol. I. p. 181.

was not less than that of the Romish priesthood in Spain; and their interference with all the occupations and arrangements of society was far greater, and more vexatious. In Spain, if the people would take care to keep themselves free from what was accounted heterodoxy, and would refrain from any attempt to interfere with, or in any manner lessen the power of the ecclesiastics, a large margin was left free for such pursuits and the enjoyment of such pleasures as they were inclined to indulge in. The sour spirit of the Presbyterian divines extended to all the habits and pursuits of the people. Almost everything of a pleasurable character was denounced as sin; friendship, and even family affections, were outraged; and a gloomy superstition, supported by doctrines of a most terrific character, and attributing to the Deity what would have been considered hateful and detestable beyond expression in any other being, spread a deep and heart-withering gloom over the length and breadth of the land. But we shall for the present refrain from any further remarks on the subject of religion, and proceed to the more interesting portion of the volume which we have undertaken to review.

The sixth and last chapter is entitled, "An Examination of the Scotch Intellect during the Eighteenth Century." It is in this chapter that the author, in his comments on the many great men of the century, brings out most fully his own philosophical opinions; and it is to them, and to those of the authors of whose works he treats, that we shall particularly give our attention. We reluctantly, and for want of room, pass over the solution by the author of what he justly calls the paradox, that the Scotch have been liberal in politics and illiberal in religion.

Mr. Buckle explains what he terms the deductive character of the Scotch philosophers of the 18th century, by the turn towards theology which the Scotch mind had taken for a long period. As in some of his observations on deductive philosophy, and the distinction between it and the inductive, we cannot agree with him, we will proceed to examine what he says on the subject:

"In nearly every other country," he says, "where the intellect has fairly arrayed itself against the exclusive pretensions of the Church, it has happened that the secular philosophy which has been engendered has been an inductive philosophy, taking for its basis individual and specific experience, and seeking by that means to overthrow the general and traditional notions on which all church power is founded. The plan has been, to refuse to accept principles which could not be substantiated by facts; while the opposite and theological plan is, to force facts to yield to principles. In the former case, experience precedes theory; in the latter case, theory precedes experience and controls it. In theology, certain principles are taken for granted, and it being deemed impious to question them, all that remains for us is to reason for them



downwards. This is the deductive method. On the other hand, the inductive method will concede nothing, but insists upon reasoning upwards, and demands that we shall have the liberty of ascertaining the principles for ourselves."—Pp. 410, 411.

We confess this passage seems to us not to be a discrimination of two methods of philosophizing, that which is called the deductive method being merely conjectural, and not at all deserving the name of philosophy. All that ought to be so called must be founded on a knowledge of facts, either intuitive, or acquired by reflection or observation. In deductive philosophy, the deduction must be from some known fact. The very term deduction assumes that something exists from which the deduction is made, otherwise it is merely conjecture and hypothesis. We are far from thinking that the hypotheses of men of genius are to be disregarded. They may lead us to philosophy, but they are not of themselves philosophy. Newton *conjectured* that the diamond was combustible; but the conjecture was not made at random, but was founded on his having observed in the diamond a property usually found in combustible bodies; and his conjecture proved to be true. We can hardly think that the author holds opinions on this subject different from those just stated, although his language seems sometimes to imply it; for he says, in describing what he calls a return to the deductive method,

"This we are, in many respects, justified in doing, *because, in the progress of our knowledge, we have by a long course of induction arrived at several conclusions which we may safely treat deductively.*"—P. 419.

The italics are ours, and we insert them because we think this a just account of the proper method of philosophy,—first bringing together materials by induction; and then making deductions from the facts thus accumulated. In another place he says,

"It is often said, and probably with truth, that all deduction is preceded by induction; so that, in every syllogism, the major premiss, however obvious and necessary it may appear, is merely a generalization of facts, or a record of what the senses had already observed."—P. 582.

We have an intuitive knowledge of our own existence, and of our sensations and perceptions; and from that knowledge some deductions may be made: all our materials for deduction beyond this must be derived from reflection, observation or experiment. Mr. Buckle informs us that "Bacon was deficient in deduction" (p. 572); but this is an assertion which we cannot admit to be true. It is, however, we presume, the only reason why he does not place that wonderful man on an equality with Aristotle and Newton. We entirely agree with the author that "poetry and philosophy should be considered allies and not enemies" (p. 502). Notwithstanding the arguments by which the author endeavours to shew that we cannot sympathize with our great poets in the same degree as their contemporaries, we believe that our two

greatest poets are far better understood and more justly appreciated in our days than they were in their own times and for a considerable period afterwards. Shakspeare seems to have had but one of his contemporaries who fully recognized his genius. "The ever-memorable" John Hales, as he is well called, asserted that if any one would produce the finest passages from the Greek and Roman classics, he would find something superior in the works of Shakspeare. The challenge is said to have been accepted, and a few individuals, of whom Lord Falkland was one, met together; and the result was that, in the opinion of the meeting, Hales proved his assertion. In Dryden's *Essay on Dramatic Literature*, which is a dialogue, all the speakers, excepting him who represents Dryden, seem to agree in giving the superiority in dramatic literature to Ben Jonson; and even Dryden goes no further than to say that there is another (Shakspeare) whom he considers equal and *perhaps superior* to Jonson. In those days, Beaumont and Fletcher's plays were much more frequently acted than Shakspeare's. Few in our days will think that Pope and Johnson, in the prefaces to their editions of Shakspeare's plays, or Johnson in his remarks on them, have fully appreciated the genius of our unrivalled poet. In the next age, Lord Shaftesbury, after having bestowed some praise on both Shakspeare and Milton, says that in England poetry is in its infancy. Cowley and Dryden were far more popular than their contemporary, Milton; and Addison's papers in the *Spectator* first awakened the public mind to a sense of Milton's superlative merits as a poet. All impartial persons will, we think, agree with Mr. Buckle that the age in which we live is, "in nearly all respects, greater than any the world has yet seen" (p. 506).

Our limits oblige us to confine our observations on Scotch literature to three of the greatest authors whom that country has produced.

We were pleased to read our author's encomiums on Hutcheson, whom we consider the best moral philosopher among Scotchmen. "The deductive inquirer," says Mr. Buckle, "assumes certain principles as original, and reasons from them to the facts which actually appear in the world" (p. 429). It is plain, however, that this philosophy cannot command our assent, unless the principles assumed are true; and whether they be so or not must depend, in moral philosophy, on our forming a just conclusion from what we perceive in our own minds and those of others. Observation must precede the assumption of principle; otherwise they are mere conjectures, and are of no value in philosophy, except in the way of suggestion, by which an unfounded hypothesis may sometimes assist in leading to the truth. Those who agree with Hutcheson in the existence of what he calls a *moral sense*, but which it seems to us should rather be called a *moral sentiment*, consider our moral nature as truly an original prin-



ciple as our rational nature; and observation of human nature leads us to admit both to be original principles. Hutcheson considers *disinterestedness* as essential to virtue; but though disinterestedness is the highest branch of virtue, the universal sentiments of mankind allow prudence, which looks to our future well-being, and temperance, which procures us health, to lie within the category of virtue.

Adam Smith is, in the estimation of our author, "by far the greatest of all the Scotch thinkers" (pp. 432, 457). That the *Wealth of Nations* is the *greatest work* produced by a Scotchman, will probably be universally admitted; but in force and largeness of thought and in acuteness, Hume appears to us, in spite of his faults and errors, superior to Smith. With respect to Smith's Theory of Moral Sentiments, in which he lays it down that sympathy is the source of all our moral sentiments, we were not aware that any one at the present day held that opinion. Our sympathies are applied to our fellow-creatures in very different proportions. We prefer our countrymen to strangers, and our friends and relations to our countrymen; but the moral sentiment of right and wrong is applied equally to all. If we were to see a man in possession of great riches who made a generous and liberal use of them, and were to be informed that he had really no right to his property, but that it lawfully belonged to another person of a harsh and selfish disposition, our sympathy would be excited to the first, but our moral sentiment would induce us to give the property to the right owner. It is justly observed by Mackintosh, that sympathy has nothing of an *imperative* character,\* which assuredly belongs to the moral principle. How can sympathy account for our moral approbation of prudence, temperance and chastity, or for self-condemnation when we have transgressed the laws of morality? In short, Adam Smith's Theory seems to us a mere sport of the imagination,—elegant and pleasant to read, but as to its philosophy entirely erroneous. All the world agrees in the superlative merit of the *Wealth of Nations*; but Smith's imputing all the actions of men to self-interest is indeed a grievous error; and so Mr. Buckle seems to consider it, although he defends his two one-sided views of human nature in his two great works in a way which we must confess ourselves unable to understand. He seems to think that two errors combined may establish a truth. Mr. Buckle remarks that "human institutions are constantly stopping our advance by thwarting our natural inclinations. And no wonder that this should be the case, seeing that the men who are at the head of affairs, and by whom the institutions are contrived, have, perhaps, a certain rough and practical sagacity; but being from the narrowness of their understandings incapable of large views, their

---

\* Ethical Philosophy, p. 240.

counsels are determined by those mere casual fluctuations which alone they are able to perceive" (pp. 447, 448). The wholesale condemnation of *all* statesmen, as men of narrow understandings, will hardly pass muster with calm and dispassionate thinkers.

The high intellectual powers of Hume excite the admiration of Mr. Buckle, as they must of every one who is not prevented by his unhappy errors from doing him justice. The following passage seems to us to lie at the root of the author's great mistake (as we think it) as to deductive philosophy:

"He not only believed, with perfect justice, that ideas are more important than facts, but he supposed that they should hold the first place in the order of study, and that they should be developed before the facts are investigated."—P. 464.

He seems here to forget that *ideas are facts*, as well as the phenomena which are presented to us from without. The method of proceeding, in all philosophical investigations, should be regulated by a just consideration how far our knowledge of our own sensations, perceptions and reflections, will enable us to judge of external things: this in many cases is considerable, in many others scarcely anything. The author thinks that Hume's dislike of the Baconian philosophy has made him grossly unfair towards that wonderful man; and that was probably one of the causes of his most inadequate estimate of Bacon; but we must bear in mind that, we believe with the single exception of Newton, all English authors are placed by Hume much lower than the universal opinion of critics, and readers capable of forming a judgment on literary performances, will now place them. Hume, in common with Montaigne and Shaftesbury, was an exclusive and bigoted admirer of the literature of Greece and Rome, and gave at best but a limited and unwilling applause to any writers who departed widely from the classical models. Great praise is given to Hume's *Natural History of Religion*. As our opinion of this work is in direct opposition to that of Mr. Buckle, we will proceed to examine the principle on which it is founded. This is stated by Hume with his usual clearness in the following words: "The further we mount up to antiquity, the more do we find mankind plunged into polytheism. No marks, no symptoms of any more perfect religion. The most eminent records of the human race still present us with that system as the popular and established creed. The north, the south, the east, the west, give their unanimous testimony to the same fact. What can be opposed to so full an evidence?" (sect. i.). Now here Hume has adopted the right mode of philosophizing, by reasoning from facts; but he seems to us to have assumed the fact of the universality of polytheism in the earliest periods of the world, without satisfactory evidence. A very ancient book, called the *Old Testament*, professes to give an account of the earliest history of mankind. Now



whatever opinion may be formed of the authority of this book, we do not think that any candid person can doubt that it contains an authentic account of the religious opinions of the Israelites at a very early period of the world, quite as early as any in which we have any reliable history of any other nation; and this book shews that they were from the beginning monotheists. There seems also good reason to think that Brahminism, one of the earliest forms of religion with which we have any acquaintance, was originally, whether it be so now or not, monotheistical. With such evidence before us, we must consider Hume's assertion devoid of proof, and the superstructure built upon it falls to the ground.

Mr. Buckle tells us that Hume's theory of miracles, in connection, on the one hand, with the principles of reason and evidence, and, on the other, with the laws of causation, is worked out with consummate skill; and after having received the modifications of Brown, has now become the foundation on which the best inquirers into these matters take their stand (p. 460). The "best inquirers" are, of course, those who agree with the author. We have not in our minds the modifications introduced by Brown, nor have we the book at hand to refer to; but we are perfectly satisfied of the unsoundness of Hume's argument, and of the inaccurate language in which it is expressed, and we think that it has been more than once refuted. "A miracle," says Hume, "is a violation of the laws of nature; and as a firm and unalterable experience has established these laws, the proof against a miracle, from the very nature of the fact, is as entire as any argument from experience can possibly be imagined." Now what is the proof that there has never been a departure from the laws of nature? Hume certainly could not mean the experience of his own life, or that of the oldest man who has ever lived. The only rational meaning which we can give to his language is, that the history of all times shows that there has never been a deviation from the laws of nature. Now this is so far from being the case, that we find in all the early histories of nations accounts of miracles. We are far from admitting the credibility of these accounts; but they shew that the supposed unanimity of historical testimony is not what Hume has represented it to be. Hume's argument against the credibility of any account of miracles is expressed as follows: "No testimony is sufficient to establish a miracle, unless the testimony be of such a kind that its falsehood would be more miraculous than the fact which it endeavours to establish." A miracle is a deviation from the ordinary course of nature, and it is therefore evident that one fact cannot be "more miraculous" than another. The word he should have used is "incredible;" and it is on this ground that the Christian apologist is willing to encounter him. With respect to what all Christians consider the most important of all miracles,

the proposition they profess to establish is this—it is more incredible that those who asserted the fact that Jesus had risen from the dead, should, in the circumstances in which they were placed, have asserted a falsehood, than that Jesus should have been really raised from the dead.

Mr. Buckle informs his readers that the “advance of knowledge, by increasing the authority of the intellectual class, undermines, and must eventually overthrow, mere hereditary and accidental distinctions” (p. 303). There is a country with which Mr. Buckle is better acquainted than he can possibly be with any other, and in which we feel pretty sure that he will agree with us in thinking that a higher intelligence, more private and public virtue, and more real liberty are enjoyed than in any other, yet in which hereditary distinctions exist in full force. We must therefore think that the advance of knowledge will lead its inhabitants to support and cherish those institutions under which it has attained its unrivalled superiority.

We have now come to the most painful part of our task. We lament to say, that it cannot be denied, that the tendency of this work is irreligious. In reference to our writers on Natural Theology, Mr. Buckle says,

“It is now generally admitted that nothing can be made of it, and that it is impossible to establish the old theological premisses by a chain of inductive reasoning. Respecting this, the most eminent philosophers agree with the most eminent theologians; and since the time of Kant in Germany, and of Coleridge in England, none of our ablest men, even among divines themselves, have recurred to a plan which Paley, indeed, pursued with vigour, but of which our Bridgwater Treatises, our Prize Essays, and such school-boy productions, are poor and barren imitations.” Pp. 412, 413.

And in a note, after admitting the great scientific merit of some of the Bridgwater Treatises, he adds:

“But the religious portion of them is pitiable, and shews either that their heart was not in the work, or else that the subject was too wide for them.”

We have nothing more to say of these quotations than that we altogether dissent from them, excepting as to the superiority of Paley's work to any subsequent one with which we are acquainted. So excellent, indeed, is it, as to render any subsequent efforts on the same subject almost useless.

In a passage (pp. 577, 578) too long for us to quote, Mr. Buckle says, that “on theological subjects we have no trustworthy information and no means of obtaining any;” thus denying the validity of any evidence of the truth of either natural or revealed religion. The greatest minds who have advanced and adorned our science and literature have come to a very different conclusion. To say nothing of the many eminent Englishmen



who have been of the ecclesiastical order, we find Bacon, Boyle, Locke and Newton, all sincere believers in the truth of the Christian religion. Can the author find greater names than these in our history? and does it become him or any man to express himself in such very confident terms in opposition to these great names? Mr. Buckle often mentions "the most advanced thinkers;" but those who have gone furthest beyond the opinions of the age in which they have lived, have often fallen into great errors, which prevailed for a short time, and then were heard no more. Descartes, Malebranche and Leibnitz, were all advanced thinkers; but the vortexes of the first, the notion of seeing all things in God of the second, and the pre-established harmony of the third, have all been long ago deservedly consigned to the tomb of oblivion, without the slightest hope of a resurrection. With respect to the German philosophers, they are still on their trial, and what their ultimate reputation and influence may be, no one can say. We will content ourselves with observing of German philosophy, that hitherto one system seems to have put down another with a pretty rapid succession. It would be unjust to deny to Coleridge the praise of having acquired a vast fund of knowledge, of possessing great intellectual powers, a most fertile imagination, and a memory almost miraculous, which together made him master of an eloquence so engaging as to attract numerous audiences, willing to attend to his discourses for hours together. If, however, we are to estimate the value of his writings, allowing that a few very fine sentences are to be found scattered about here and there, and that there is much which may suggest valuable hints to others, we find them, for the most part, extremely obscure; and we cannot see that they have added in any material degree to just philosophical views. To us, we confess that their general character may be described metaphorically, but justly, as

Rich windows which exclude the light,  
And passages which lead to nothing.

In a page of this volume (p. 489), Mr. Buckle speaks of "the Divine Architect who called the material world into being." It appears, therefore, that he is a believer in the existence of an intelligent First Cause of all things. In the expression of his moral sentiments, we find much in which we cordially agree. He is on all occasions the friend of liberty, and the enemy of every species of oppression and tyranny. His anxiety for the spread of knowledge, and the advancement of civilization, no impartial person can doubt; and there are many passages in the book which indicate that he is deeply interested in the domestic charities of life. We quite agree with him that there is far more good than evil in the world (pp. 426, 427).

On the general subject of philosophy, we will only add, that it is to the mighty genius who produced the *De Augmentis* and the

*Novum Organum*,—and who, by the united powers of the strongest reason, a richly productive imagination, and a forcible eloquence,—an assemblage of great and noble qualities, perhaps, not to be found in the same degree in any other of the sons of men,—though he did not produce, enforced, elucidated and amplified the sound principles of philosophy to such a degree as justly to entitle him to be called the father of modern philosophy,—that we must look for the best instruction in the method of philosophy. If we desert it, we may be entertained by pleasant inventions of the imagination; but we shall flounder about in a chaos of errors, and “find no end in wandering mazes lost.”

---

PRAYER TO CHRIST IN UNITARIAN WORSHIP.\*

7. Leaving Professor Martineau in the hands of Professor Jowett, I remark again that the evidence, as adduced in the last particular, is nullified by the context. I hope that the wise and honest words just cited are ringing and will long ring in the ears of the reader. They contain a general principle very important and constantly applicable in the interpretation of passages, events and phrases, borrowed in the New Testament from the Old. The “analogy” to which the writer refers as between the religion of Jehovah without a Mediator, and the religion of Jehovah with a Mediator (Christ), sufficed to lead Paul to speak of the latter in terms strictly applicable only to the former; for, indeed, the second was only the fulfilment and the completion of the first. Hence passages are applied to Christ which were originally used of God. Ignorant of, or unwilling to acknowledge, the analogy in question in its consequences on the language of the New Testament, Trinitarians have identified Jehovah and Jesus. Pursuing their method, Mr. Martineau declares that “ineffaceable traces lie on the New Testament itself of invocation to Christ as the distinctive habit of the apostolic church.” The two conclusions are equally without solid foundation; nor could they be put forth if due regard were paid to sound principles of biblical interpretation. Among such principles this one holds no mean place, namely, that a writer should be allowed to explain his own meaning, that in listening to his words the context of the passage to be explained should receive first attention, and that the persons who may be presumed to be perplexed and those to whom extrication is tendered should be the same. Following these canons, which are simple, common-sense utterances, I find, in words immediately preceding those adduced in evidence, all the

---

\* Continued from p. 413.



light the latter could need to make them universally intelligible, and to exhibit them in unison with the general tenor of the New Testament. I quote the entire passage: "*The word is nigh thee, in thy mouth and in thy heart; that is, the word of faith which we preach, that if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation. For the scripture saith, Whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed. For there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek; for the same Lord (Jehovah) is over all, rich unto all that call upon him. For whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved (Joel ii. 32). How, then, are they to call on him in whom they have not believed?*" Here it is obvious that "to call on him" is of the same import as to "confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus." Consequently "to call on" is "to confess." The "him" of the text is clearly Jehovah. This is the original meaning of the term Lord as here used. This remained the one use of the term until "the Servant of the Lord" came. Then, by "analogy," it was applied to Christ. The term being so applied, phrases embodying the term and believed to refer to the Messiah were also applied to Christ. The applications were general and vague, sometimes obscure. Their general import, however, is unmistakable, and in their general import alone are they to be taken. Now in Joel, whence the phrase is taken, the prophet intends to describe faithful sons of Jacob. These were known not by an outer act so much as by a state of mind. Yet the outer act was the earlier, as was natural in a religion of the senses. The outer act being the earlier, naturally and inevitably remained to denote the state of mind when at a later day the spiritualism of the prophets had gone some way to establish itself in Israel. Hence "to call on the name of Jehovah" came to signify not to invoke Jehovah so much as to hold, and as to hold so to profess, his religion. Under the gospel, the spiritualizing process came to its completion, and so the disciples of Christ received for one of their denominations that of those "who called on the name of the Lord." It is in a secondary sense that the phrase is used of Christians. The phrase had gradually come to denote the true worshipers considered as actively professing the true worship, which was first the religion of Jehovah, and then the religion of the God and Father of the Lord Jesus Christ. Thus regarded, it is a synonym for "Christian," which was given to the disciples of Christ at Antioch, and takes its stand with other and far more prevalent denominations of those disciples, such as "saints," "brethren," "children of God," "sons of God," &c. If any one name more than another deserves to be called the distinctive badge of Christian discipleship in the apos-

tolic age, it is "disciple" or "brethren" or "saint." Similar flexibility of meaning, or rather of application, is known by linguists to be common, especially in cultivated languages. Our own "to call on" affords an example, varying as it does from the sense of requiring and visiting to that of invoking and adoring. This variableness is illustrated in the corresponding Greek original. The *ἐπικαλεῖσθαι* signifies to call on for yourself or on your own behalf. No matter what the object. If the object be a human being, then it means to address or request something for your own good. If the object be God, then it means to ask in prayer for aid or support. Accordingly, in the passages quoted by Mr. Martineau, it signifies equally an appeal to Cæsar and an appeal to God (1 Pet. i. 17; 2 Cor. i. 23; Acts xxv. 11). Indeed, as if to shew that the religion does not lie in the word, but comes, when it exists, from the object on which the action of the verb falls, the verb is in the book of Acts applied no less than six times to denote a legal appeal to the Roman emperor. The form and the usage are somewhat peculiar when "name" (e.g., "the name of Christ") stands as the object; for as "name" in the Bible denotes what we call authority, influence, cause or undertaking, so "to call on the name of Christ" signifies to make and declare Christ your Master. This meaning arises whether you understand the construction to be "to call on the name of Christ," or "to call on yourself the name of Christ," or "to call yourself by the name of Christ," or "to appeal to the name, authority or protection of Christ," as you appeal to the tribunal of an earthly monarch. In the sense of calling the name of Christ on or on behalf of yourself, the meaning comes into agreement with eleven instances in the New Testament (the class of passages to which I before said Mr. Martineau had not made reference) in which the verb is rendered in our version "surnamed." Here, then, we see the point at which the two classes of significations—those which give "call themselves by the name of Christ," "take on themselves the name of Christ," or "surname themselves Christian"—are found in agreement with those which denote "to call on God," Christ or man, or, with a still further deviation, "to call on inanimate things:" e.g.,

Deep calleth unto deep at the noise of thy waterspouts.

All thy waves and thy billows are gone over me (Ps. xlii. 7);

where *ἐπικαλεῖσθαι* is used in the Septuagint. The scriptural link which connects the meanings together may be found in James ii. 7: "Do not they blaspheme the holy name by which ye are called?" literally, "which is called on you,"—called, that is, whether by others or by yourselves,—called originally in baptism and ever after as a designation. The name of Christ being called on the disciples, they on their part took the name of Christ; and being known as those who were constantly appealing to Christ,



they bore the name of Christ, and were denominated Christians. The intimate connection of the two significations is acknowledged by Alford in his Commentary on 1 Cor. i. 2, where he says, "*not calling themselves by*, though in sense equivalent to this, for they who *call upon Christ call themselves by his name*;" adding in the connection these words: "The Church of England has adopted from this verse her solemn explanation of the term in the 'Prayer for all Sorts and Conditions of Men:' 'More especially we pray for the good estate of the Catholic Church; that it may be so guided and governed by thy good Spirit, that all *who profess and call themselves Christians* may be led into the way of truth, and hold the faith in unity of spirit, in the bond of peace, and in righteousness of life.'"

There is, then, no incompatibility between the two classes of translations, though they are represented by Mr. Martineau as standing in broad opposition. Nor, indeed, was it to be supposed that scholars so eminent as those who have put forward the meaning of "to take on yourself the name of Christ," and so "to espouse and profess the gospel," on the one side, or those who on the other declared that the verb meant "to call on or invoke the name of Christ," should either of them have spoken without sufficient warrant. By the view now given, not only the two sets of passages are harmonized, but language of a marked character is seen to be in complete agreement with the facts. Certain is it that converts were baptized into the name of the Son. Certain is it that the name of the Son was called or pronounced on converts. Certain is it that converts are spoken of as those upon whom the name of the Lord is called (Acts xv. 17). Certain it is that the disciples bore the honourable name of their Lord (James ii. 7). Certain equally that they considered it their duty to do all things in the name of Christ (Col. iii. 17). Indeed, they were known as continually "naming the name of Christ," and considering the profession they thus made as a bond and a pledge to depart from iniquity (2 Tim. ii. 19). Finally, as they were noted by the heathen for ceaselessly speaking of Christ, they received from their enemies the really distinctive name of Christians, which they have ever since retained. If, however, Mr. Martineau's doctrine is correct, that they were always distinguished by the habit of invoking Christ, they would have been habitually called Christ-invokers or worshipers of Christ. Before I quit this part of my subject, I will give what I may term the statistics of this verb *ἐπικαλεῖσθαι*, as they are found in the New Testament, with the renderings given in King James's translation. The verb in one form or another is used in all two-and-thirty times. Of these, it is used

7 times (Acts ii. 21, xv. 17; Heb. xi. 16; Rom. x. 12, 13; 2 Cor. i. 23; 1 Pet. i. 17) of God or the name of God.

4 times (Acts vii. 59, xxii. 16; Rom. x. 14; 2 Tim. ii. 22) of either God or Christ.

12 times (Matt. x. 3; Luke xxii. 3; Acts i. 23, iv. 36, x. 5, x. 18, x. 32, xi. 13, xii. 12, xii. 25, xv. 22; James ii. 7) of ordinary men.

6 times (Acts xxv. 11, xxv. 12, xxv. 21, xxv. 25, xxvi. 32, xxviii. 19) of the emperor of Rome.

3 times (Acts ix. 14, ix. 21; 1 Cor. i. 2) of the name of Christ.

Out of the thirty-two times, eighteen are applications to human beings, seven to God, four to God or to Christ, leaving only three by which "the habit" of invoking Christ can be sustained. Supposing these three to wear the appearance of favouring religious homage to Christ, the appearance must be qualified, if it is not counteracted, by the eighteen passages in which the act denoted by the verb is predicated of men. The senses or applications of the verb appear in this table:

call	call on	be called	appeal	surname or surnamed
1	11	3	6	11 = 32.

Observe, "invoke" is not once used; "call on" is used only eleven out of thirty-two times. Of these eleven, but three refer to Christ; while three are represented by "be called," six by "appeal," and eleven by "surname or surnamed." In the case of the three connected with Christ, it is not Christ himself, but *the name* of Christ, on which persons are said to call. Viewed as a whole and in its several relations, the table illustrates the ease with which "call" may pass into "call on;" "call on" into "call on the name of another;" "call on the name of another" into "call the name of another on yourself," and so into "be surnamed by" or "bear the name of another." Hence, out of constantly using the name of Christ, the disciples grew to be called *Christians* (comp. Rom. xv. 20; Is. xliii. 6, 7, lxiii. 19, lxv. 1; Ps. lxxix. 6).

The three passages in which disciples are described as calling on the name of Christ, are those on which Mr. Martineau mainly relies. To these a fourth is to be added, one of doubtful application, namely, that of Stephen's violent death. The principles we have laid down and the truths we have established will make a review of these proof-texts easy and brief. I advert first to the case of Stephen (Acts vii. 59). The participle *ἐπικαλοῦμενον* does not denote Christ as the object addressed by Stephen. It does not declare that he addressed any object.\* The object he addressed may have been God. It would be easy to adduce authorities to support the probability. The object may have been Christ. Say, however, that Stephen calls on Christ. By no means does it follow that he called on him religiously. He

\* Rilliet, in his recently published excellent translation into French of "The New Testament from the most Ancient Greek Text," renders the word thus—*Etienne, qui disait dans son invocation—Stephen, who said in his invocation.*



may have appealed to Christ after the manner in which Paul appealed to Cæsar. He may also have done no more than openly and aloud confess the Christ in whose cause he was suffering insult and violence. So far as "calling on" is concerned, this, and nothing more than this, is necessarily implied. But he proceeds to put up a petition to Christ.

The case is obviously exceptional. Stephen beholds Christ, and in his extremity naturally calls on him for succour. The same exigency would now justify the same act. But the time and place of death are not the time and place of vision, says Mr. Martineau, who appears to wish his readers to infer hence that the case was a normal and not an exceptional one. The difference as to time and place was inconsiderable. The whole outrage would occupy but a few minutes. Falling on Stephen in the council chamber, the enraged bigots hurried him away to the outside of the city, which from the nature of the localities they could speedily reach, and there stoned him to death. At the first it seems to be admitted he saw "the Son of man standing at the right hand of God." Whatever the nature of the sight, it was doubtless a reality. As a reality, it would endure in the apostle's mind until the end. Why not? If a reality, it had God for its author. Now God does nothing in vain, and if God and Christ appeared at all, they appeared to encourage and support their confessor. That object could not be accomplished until the brutality had perpetrated the murder. Mr. Martineau seems to doubt whether Stephen did more than see with the eye of his mind. It will be time enough to attend to such an objection when he tells us how he distinguishes between ocular and mental vision. Meanwhile, the writer reports an actual sight, and if Mr. Martineau is not disposed to believe the report, he is not justified in appealing to the narrative in which it is made. This instance, however, he designates a "practical example" (p. 220). If by "practical" he means one that may be practised or followed, he deduces a general conclusion from a particular and abnormal fact.

Adverting now to the trilateral stronghold of invocation, namely, Acts ix. 14, ix. 21, xxii. 16, I find that the first forms part of a conversation held by Ananias in a vision. Here, then, Christ is seen, but not invoked. One would have thought that the "habit" of the early church would have brought Ananias on his knees as soon as he discerned Christ. Nothing of the sort. Simply there ensues a conversation equally cool and deliberate. In that conversation, Ananias describes disciples of Christ as "those who call on thy name" (14). The real meaning is made clear by the equivalent term, "thy saints," used by the speaker in the foregoing verse. "Thy saints," then, and those "who call on thy name," are different forms expressive of the same relation—the relation of faithful discipleship to Christ. Mr.

Martineau, however, dislikes visions. "It will hardly be contended, I suppose, that Christ *was really seen and within hearing*" (p. 220). Well, if Christ was neither seen nor heard, the form of speech which Mr. Martineau puts in in evidence could not have been used. If the vision is denied, the bubble bursts, and we may save ourselves the trouble of investigating films of which all we know is that they are films.

The fall of this first tower brings down the second; for if there was no vision as between Christ and Ananias, there was no mission of the latter by the former. Ananias, not being sent by Christ to Saul, did not go to Saul, and not going to Saul, he did not speak to Saul. Consequently Saul's eyes were not unscaled. Remaining spiritually dark, he did not preach the gospel in Damascus; and as he did not preach the gospel, the Damascenes did not in wonder exclaim, "Is not this he that destroyed them which called on this name in Jerusalem?" (Acts ix. 15, seq.). If, however, Mr. Martineau accepts the narrative, is he willing to learn his theology from the inhabitants of Damascus? Be it so. Then he must teach that the primitive Christians invoked not Christ only, but also the name of Christ; for is it not said that the Jerusalem Christians "called on this (Christ's) name"? (21). It is strange indeed, if the invocation of Christ were the distinguishing badge of the early Christians, that the Damascenes had to go so far as Jerusalem for their instance. It was the preaching of Paul that called for their words of amazement. Surely Paul, in "preaching Christ in the synagogues, that he is the Son of God" (20), did not omit to inculcate by word and example the duty of invoking him, which was so important as to be universally observed. The distance, however, which they had to travel, proves that Paul knew nothing of the practice, and the apostle appears to have contented himself with "confounding the Jews" and "proving that this is very Christ" (22).

The fate of the first and second fort awaits the third, for the passage in Acts xxii. 16, is only another report of the same "baseless fabric of a vision." Nevertheless, we will look at the words, since, whencesoever they come, they are here. Ananias says to Paul, as in the name of Christ, "Why tarriest thou? Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." Here again occurs a stumbling-block. Baptism washes away sins. The language is clear. By the majority of Christians it is received literally. Will Mr. Martineau put himself in sympathy with that majority by receiving the words in their proper sense? And yet he insists that the ensuing phrase, "calling on the name of the Lord," can be understood in no other way than literally. I will indulge him for once; and then "to call on the name of the Lord" is to call, not on the Lord, but on his name. The invocation of the name of Christ must therefore be substituted for the invocation of



Christ himself. But an invoked name is very like a divinized stock or stone, that is, it is very like a *fétiche*. Not to press the consequence, I add that it does not appear that by "the Lord" here used Jesus is meant, whom the speaker almost in the same breath describes as "the" (not "*that*," as in the Common Version) "the Just One," and who had not yet probably come to be known, at least to unconverted persons, as Saul now was, as "*the* Lord." The phrase seems to have been borrowed from the Hebrew church, of which Ananias till recently was a member; and its use here suggests that it was the established formula for making public profession of faith on the part of a new convert. I conclude this part of my animadversions by observing that these three passages, when looked closely into, are found to be but one. One or three, they do little for the cause in support of which they have been put forward.

There remains the passage in 1 Cor. i. 2. I quote the entire verse: (Paul) "Unto the church of God which is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called saints, with all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, both theirs and ours." The words suggest a useful caution. The immoralities that were in the church at Corinth are well known. Yet the apostle terms the disciples there indiscriminately "the church of God," says they are "called" of God, and describes them as "holy." Press the words, require them to be taken *ad unguem*, and you make the apostle into a falsifier, or at least into an adulator. The caution hence taught applies with equal force to the phrase, "that call upon the name of Jesus Christ;" only, if a strictly literal acceptation is to be required, I must be allowed to plead for the invocation of the name itself. Instead of urging the duty of consistency, I shall consult the instruction of my readers more by citing the following from Dean Stanley's valuable Commentary on Paul's Epistles to the Corinthians (Vol. I. p. 30). Citing the words *σὺν πᾶσι τοῖς ἐπικαλουμένοις—ἡμῶν*, he makes these remarks: "This may be, 1, 'I address not only the Christians of Corinth, but those of Achæa generally,' as in 2 Cor. i. 1; 2, 'I address not only the natives of Corinth, but the numerous strangers who are passing to and fro through it;' but rather, 3, 'I address and salute not only you, but all Christians throughout the world.' This last sense seems required by the emphasis of the latter part of the sentence, *ἐν παντί τόπῳ* and *αὐτῶν καὶ ἡμῶν*, in other parts of the world beside your own. 'He is the Lord of all of them, no less than of me and you.' *ἐπικαλούμενος τὸ ὄνομα του κυρίου ἡμῶν* I. X., is the usual phrase expressing the relation of Christians to our Lord, somewhat more precise than the Hebrew *יְהוָה* of which it is the translation in the Septuagint, inasmuch as it expresses not so much the general idea of worship or praise, as of calling to aid (comp. Acts ii. 21, ix. 14, 21, vii. 59; Rom. x. 13, 14; 2 Tim. ii. 22), and as illus-

trated by the popular use, *Καίσαρα ἐπικαλεῖσθαι* ('to appeal to the Emperor'), Acts xxv. 11, 12. It implies the consciousness of Christ as Lord, but especially as Saviour and deliverer." In this view, the phrase is a periphrasis for Christians, considered as those who appeal to Christ for aid, deliverance and salvation. Of the manner of the appeal, whether by direct invocation or otherwise, nothing is said. In consequence, on the authority of a dignitary of the Established Church, the phrase contributes nothing toward the "ineffaceable traces" said to "lie on the New Testament itself of invocation to Christ as the distinctive habit of the apostolic church" (p. 221). Indeed it is obvious that the phrase is synonymous with the epithet "sanctified" and the epithet "holy," and with them is a denomination of the followers of Christ,—“followers” so called, not because they literally follow Christ, but because they own and confess Christ as their leader and guide to God.

The citation thus made reminds me that Mr. Martineau adduces as on his side “Stanley, Jowett and the general voice of foreign scholars” (p. 220). If by this is meant that these “conscientious interpreters” maintain with Mr. Martineau that the phrase “to call on the name of the Lord” denotes the actual invocation of Christ, or shews that the invocation of Christ has always co-existed with the worship of the Father, I must take leave to say that he is mistaken. Stanley and Jowett appear in these pages to speak for themselves. One word or two of foreign scholars. Kuinoel explains the words in Acts ii. 21, by “*Ex mente Petri Jesum Messiam agnoscere, ejusque doctrinam amplecti ut 1 Cor. i. 2.*” “Interpreted according to Peter’s view, the passage signifies to acknowledge Jesus as the Messiah and to embrace his doctrine, as in 1 Cor. i. 2.” On Acts ix. 14, he describes the phrase, “those who call,” &c., as synonymous with *μαθητὰς τῶν κυρίου*, that is, disciples of the Lord, referring in proof to the designation as found in the first verse of the chapter. Commenting on Acts xxii. 16, he identifies “to call on the name of the Lord” with “to be baptized in his name.” Wahl, in his *Clavis Novi Testamenti*, the standard work on the subject, explains the phrase as “Formula in N. T. libris relata ad Christum et usurpata in hominibus nomen Jesu profitentibus designandis,”—that is, “a formula applied in the books of the New Testament to Christ, and used in designating men who profess the name of Jesus.” Meyer (Kommentar), on Acts vii. 59, has these remarks: “Das Steph. Jesum anrief, was höchst natürlich, da er eben Jesum, zur hülfe bereit stehend, geschaut hatte. Es ist daher eine beweisstelle für den Glauben des Steph. an die von dem erhöhten Christus verlangte theilname der glorie Gottes, nicht aber für die Gottheit Christi in Sinne der Kirche,”—that is, “that Stephen should call on Jesus was in the highest degree natural, since he had seen Jesus standing ready to give him aid. This, then, is a proof



passage of the belief of Stephen in the glorification by God of the ascended Christ, but not in the Godhead of Christ in the sense of the church." Also on Acts xxii. 16, "calling on the name of the Lord," &c.: "Τρεφὼν Ὄψον; postquam invocaveris atque ita professus fueris nomen Domini (als der Messias). Id scilicet antecedere olim debebat initiationem per baptismum faciendum,"—that is, "Wolf has excellently given the sense: 'After thou hast called on and so professed the name of the Lord (as the Messiah), for of old that was required to precede initiation into the church by baptism.'"

Dr. Bisping, Professor of Theology in the University of Münster,\* says of the phrase, in 1 Cor. i. 2, τοῖς ἐπικαλουμένοις, &c., "Das ist nur eine allgemeine bezeichnung des begriffs Christen; die den namen unsers Herrn Jesu Christi anrufen, i.e. an Christum als den Herrn und Heiland glauben, auf ihn hoffen, ihn lieben." "This is only a general description of the idea of Christian; Christians call on the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that is, believe in Christ as their Lord and Saviour, hope in him, love him."

A foreign name less unknown to ordinary students is that of Schleusner. In his *Lexicon* (Vol. I. p. 906), he says, on Acts ii. 21: "Quicumque pia mente amplexus fuerit religionem Christianam felix evadat,"—that is, "Whoever shall have piously embraced the Christian religion shall become happy." Referring to Acts ix. 14, as having the same signification, he interprets "calling on the name of the Lord," in Acts xxii. 16, thus: "Ita ut Christo nomen des,"—"So as to give your name (as his disciple) to Christ." I have reserved to the last the words of Bretschneider, since they have a more general bearing: "Was das beten zu Christo als Erbarmer und Helfer in aller, namentlich, zeitlicher und leiblicher noth, so wië das vorzugsweise und fast ausschliessliche beten zum Heilande betrifft, so ist dies nichts als eine gewohnheit des neuen Pietismus, von dem die ältere Christliche Kirche nichts weiss. Vielmehr ist diese gewohnheit gegen das wort und das bestandige und unzweifelhafte beispiel des N. T. welches Gott allein als den Erbarmer und Helfer in aller noth ganz besonders der zeitl. und leibl. darstellt, und durch oftere ermahnungen und so viele beispiele uns anweist in unsere noth zu Gott zu beten. Mithin ist diese gewohnheit eine unevangelische und verwerfliche." "As to praying to Christ as one who is merciful and powerful in all temporal and bodily need, as well as the preferred and almost exclusive supplication of the Saviour, this is nothing but a habit of our new Methodism, of which the ancient Christian church knew nothing. What is more important is, that this habit is contrary to the word and

---

\* Erklärung des ersten Briefes an die Korinther, 1855. The learned author has published Commentaries on other books of scripture.

the constant and indubitable example of the New Testament, which sets before us God alone as the Merciful One and the Helper in all need, especially temporal and bodily, and, by frequent exhortation and so many examples, directs us in our need to pray to God. Consequently this habit is unevangelical and to be put away." \*

The last quotation is specially apposite in a controversy in which the point really at issue is nothing else than prayer to Christ. On this point, as on every other connected with biblical learning, the opinion of the late Dr. Bretschneider will have no small force with every one to whom his learning and piety are known.

The testimonies of foreign scholars that I have put down from books which lie at my hand, might be increased with greater literary resources. They are sufficient in number, they are of no mean authority, they bind in one members of the principal Christian communions.

I reserve the consideration of Pliny's *Carmen Christo* and its associated points to the next number.

JOHN R. BEARD.

ADDRESS TO THE STUDENTS OF MANCHESTER NEW COLLEGE,  
LONDON, AFTER THE ANNUAL EXAMINATION, JUNE 26, 1861.

BY REV. THOMAS MADGE.

ONE of the Visitors of the College, my friend Mr. Bache, who was to have addressed you on the present occasion, having been prevented by engagements abroad from fulfilling that intention, I was requested by the Committee to act in his stead—a request to which, after some hesitation, I reluctantly acceded. That reluctance, however, I beg to say, did not arise from any feeling of indifference towards the interests of this Institution, but because I had little to say which had not already, and at no distant period, been much better said by others. When told, however, that, considering my age and long experience in the ministry, a few words from me might not be unwelcomely received, I could no longer resist yielding to wishes so kindly expressed.

After the examination through which you have just passed, it gives me much pleasure to say that from what I have been able to observe, and still more from what I learn to be the opinion of those who are more competent to judge than myself, it has given satisfactory proof of the diligence with which you have pursued your studies and the progress you have made in the

\* *Der Streit über die Anbetung Christi.* Darmstadt, 1840, p. 47.

various branches of knowledge to which your attention has been directed. Those of you whose academical course is yet to be completed will, I doubt not, continue to avail yourselves of the opportunities here afforded you of making those acquirements which will largely contribute to the usefulness and success of your future life. We have been reminded again and again that if our religious community is to hold the same place in public estimation as that which was held by our fathers, it is of vital importance that among its ministers there should be found some at least distinguished for real and exact learning. At the same time, I must own that it does not appear to me at all necessary, for the most efficient discharge of the ministerial office, that the highest scholarship should be possessed by all. A competent degree of learning—such, I mean, as the ordinary work of the ministry may call for, and which may occasionally be required for the defence of truth and the exposure of error—can hardly fail to be gained by those who have spent, as they ought to spend, the allotted period of study in this place, and under such instructors as it is your privilege to listen to. Do not suppose that I at all undervalue the highest attainments in what is especially termed learning, or in any kind of knowledge that lies within the compass of man's power to lay hold of. All I would maintain is simply this, that for him whose duty it will be to impart to others, and to impress deeply on their minds, the knowledge of those truths which will make them wise unto salvation, that high degree of learning to which I am alluding, and which in many respects is of great value, is not an essential qualification. There are diversities of gifts, and men are formed with different aptitudes. Some, by the constitution of their nature, are fitted more for a contemplative than for an active life. Let each one take that course for which he is conscious that his powers are best adapted. The work to which you are looking forward, and for which you are here preparing, is a great and noble work; and in whatever light it may be regarded by the wise and prudent of this world, there is none more truly honourable and useful to be engaged in, or which for its successful prosecution demands more the exercise of some of the best faculties and affections of our nature. To assert and vindicate the claims of religion; to assist your fellow-men in attaining to a true conception of Christian duty; to turn away their thoughts from vanity to wisdom, from the outward to the inward, from the things that are seen to the things that are not seen—in a word, from the love of self to the love of God and of all mankind—who, we may well exclaim, is sufficient for these things? I trust, therefore, that in selecting what is termed the sacred profession for your vocation in future life, you have duly weighed and considered the great responsibilities and obligations which it involves. I trust that it has been adopted by you, not hastily or thought-



lessly, or out of deference to the wishes of others, but of your own free will; from pure and generous impulses arising within, which you were unable to resist; and because you felt that it was a sphere of labour in which you could best employ whatever faculties God may have given you for the real welfare of your fellow-creatures and your own true happiness. It is only under these conditions that you will be able to bear patiently the trials and disappointments that may await you, and bravely to struggle with the difficulties and discouragements that may meet you in the course of your professional career.

Intellectually and morally qualified, however, as you may be, for the work that lies before you, there is something more to be considered, if, as preachers of God's truth, you would worthily discharge the duty incumbent upon you. As the pulpit will be, to a great degree, the scene of your ministerial labours, from which the word is to go forth, calling upon men to hear and understand what God hath done for his people, care should be taken that that word be so uttered, in a manner so clear, distinct and impressive, that it may come home to the heart and awaken into life the slumbering conscience. This is a point which has received, perhaps, too little attention. It has been too common—at least with the religious body to which we belong—to think that a well-considered and well-composed discourse are all-sufficient for the end in view. Experience, however, has taught us a different lesson; and it is now, I believe, more generally acknowledged that for the effective preaching of the everlasting gospel, regard must be had to what, at first sight, may be thought to be of very secondary importance. To command the attention of those we are addressing, our language must be plain and intelligible. Correct pronunciation, distinct utterance and a rightly-placed emphasis, are necessary to give due effect to what we are saying. On this account, extempore preaching has been strongly recommended, and certainly, where it can be done readily, without embarrassment and wearisome repetition, it is to be preferred to written discourses; but often there is little else to attract notice than a glib tongue and a vivacious delivery. I see no reason, however, if the heart of the preacher be in his subject, why there should not be as much earnestness and animation displayed, when speaking from a written discourse, as when speaking from an unwritten one. But then preaching *is* preaching, and not mere reading. The difference between that and the other is very marked, and is felt by almost every one. The tones of your voice, the very expression of your countenance, will shew this, and will tell whether the words you are uttering are the genuine expression of the feelings that are stirring within you. Especially be careful to avoid anything that has the appearance of affectation, or of being put on for the occasion. Be natural and simple, not closely imitating any one, even though

you may regard him as the very pattern of all excellence. Faults, indeed, you should use your best endeavours to correct, such as bad pronunciation, awkward gestures, and unnaturalnesses, so to speak, of every kind. To assist you in these endeavours is the principal service which a professed teacher of elocution can do for you. If he attempt more than this, the result will probably be a set, formal manner of address, which will not be pleasing even to the generality of hearers, and least of all to men of good taste and sound judgment. An earnest, manly, natural utterance, that shall make itself understood and felt, is, I repeat, the chief thing to be aimed at.

So much for the manner: and now a few words as to the subject-matter of preaching. And here I would remind you of the example left us by the apostle Paul, who, as he assures us, preached not himself, but Christ Jesus the Lord. So be it with you. It is what Christ said and did—the life that he led, and the death that he died, and the resurrection that followed—it is the revelation which he made of the character and will of God, of his relation to us and our relation to him, of our duty and our destiny, of what we are and of what we are to be—these, and not human speculations, are the themes which, with all their varied application to our condition and circumstances as frail, tempted, suffering, dying men, should form, for the most part, the burthen of our public discourses. Against this, I know it may be urged that they are of too trite and common a nature to be constantly pressed upon the attention of the hearer. But it is the glory of Christianity that all its important doctrines, all its life-giving principles, are not only adapted to general comprehension, but are fitted to meet the wants, the aspirations, the yearnings, of our moral and spiritual nature. But let them not be presented in a cold, dry, abstract form, apart from all that would give them the vigour and animation of life, but let them glow with the freshness and beauty of health; and let there be shed around them something of the light of our human affections, and they will prove to be as grateful to our feelings as they are acceptable to our understandings. “Truths,” said Coleridge, “of all others the most awful and interesting, are too-often considered as so true that they lose all the power of truth, and lie bedridden in the dormitory of the soul, side by side with the most despised and exploded errors.” These truths, then, it should be your aim and endeavour to call up from their hiding-place, to infuse into them fresh vitality and energy, and then send them forth to do the work for which they are designed.

It is a great mistake to suppose that what is delivered from the pulpit is remote from its object when it does not communicate some new information to the hearer. It is but a part of its object to inform and instruct in what is new. It must repeat, it must impress and affect; line upon line, and precept upon

precept. It must kindle afresh in the mind the ardour of conviction, and give to old and neglected truths a new and living interest. In spite of the press and the reading and lecture room—instruments, no doubt, of great and growing utility—the pulpit has not yet lost its power over the minds of men, wherever the sword of the Spirit, which is put into our hands, is wielded with the force and strength of which it is capable. In all there is the same human heart to be moved and the same chords to be touched; and to reach these, what can better avail us than the glad tidings of the gospel proclaimed by living lips in tones of earnestness, sincerity and truth? Unless by some means a sympathy is established between the preacher and hearer, there will be wanting that electric chain through which the thoughts and feelings of the one may readily pass into the mind and heart of the other.

Manners, customs, institutions, change or fall into decay; but the great essential principles of the gospel of Christ are as immutable as the Being from whom they came. In natural and experimental philosophy, new discoveries are continually taking place, and the old systems vanish and disappear. Hence it is asked, when we see progress, advancement, going on in the arts and sciences, and in almost everything else, is religion, is Christianity alone to be exempt from this law? Is there to be no progress, no advancement here? Yes! I answer, there is to be progress, there is to be advancement, if the term is understood as applying, not to the gospel itself, but only to our own views, conceptions and feelings. It is not to be inferred that because the great principles of the gospel, its leading and essential truths, are unchangeable and eternal, therefore our views and conceptions may not admit of growth and enlargement. The one must not be confounded with the other. If we lose sight of this distinction, we may be led into the error of supposing (as, indeed, has been the case with some) that Christianity has had its day, and that the time is coming when it is to give place to a new and better faith; and instead of making the most of what we have, of employing this great gift of God to the purposes for which it was intended, we shall be looking round for what we have not, saying, Lo here, and lo there! while all the time what we are seeking for is in our own hands. I would guard you, then, against the careless and indiscriminate use of this word “progress,” when applied to the great essential principles of the religion of Christ. Let it be clearly seen what is meant by it, or else it may become a misleading and mischievous phrase. I readily admit that though Christianity is wonderfully accommodated to all ranks and conditions of men, meeting the wants and necessities of all, and ministering to the improvement and happiness of all, the more the mind is enlightened and purified, the more comprehensive its grasp and the wider its range of vision, the more will it take in of the vast horizon spread out before it



in the Christian revelation. Fitted as it is for the child and the man, for the ignorant and the wise, the man has a clearer notion and a deeper insight into some of its parts than the child, and the wise stand upon much higher vantage-ground for taking the true measure of its dimensions than the ignorant. It is not that you can kindle a purer or a brighter light than that which shines upon you from the gospel of Christ, but that you may open your eyes more widely to the glories which it reveals, and place your minds more directly under the power of its influence. Like the sun of the material world, Christianity is, in fact, as it came direct from the great Teacher, fixed and immutable. And as the face of the one may be obscured to our view by the fogs and mists ascending from the earth on which we dwell, so may the true character of the other be almost hidden from us, and its aspect disfigured by the intervention of the clouds of human folly and human prejudice. For the regeneration of individual and of social man, we want no other or better guide, no higher or mightier energy, than that which is contained in the genuine gospel. What we most need is a more intimate acquaintance with its essential principles, a closer union and fellowship with its heavenly and immortal spirit, and a more constant and faithful employment of its agency as an instrument of human happiness. Instead, then, of that restless and feverish anxiety which is evinced by many for the discovery of some new element of civilization and happiness, let our solicitude and attention be rather directed towards the more faithful and energetic application of the elements which we already possess in Christian truth for exalting the character and bettering the condition of man.

Speaking now to those who are about taking leave of a collegiate life, I would observe that, in accordance with the fundamental principle of this Institution, you have enjoyed here the most perfect freedom of thought and inquiry. No confession of faith has been exacted from you. No fetters have been imposed upon your consciences. You have been left without restriction to form your own opinions upon the various subjects that have been brought under your consideration. This freedom, we trust, has been exercised by you cautiously and soberly, and not in the hasty adoption of rash and startling conclusions. It would, however, be affectation in me to conceal the hope that they have not been such as to interfere with the fulfilment of your original destination for the ministry among that class of Christians denominated Presbyterian or Unitarian. It may be that on some points of comparatively subordinate interest you have not yet made up your mind, but assuredly you cannot be without some distinct, positive, definite faith on which to ground your public ministrations. In the present state of the religious world, signs are observable from which we may infer that large and liberal views of Christianity are making some progress; but, I confess,

it gives me little or no pleasure to see that many of those who have outgrown their old traditional creeds, instead of at once throwing off all allegiance to them, still continue to keep up a nominal adherence to them, by first looking at them through the light of their own reason, and then taking them in the new sense which that light has reflected upon them. In this way, by putting new meanings into old words, while it enables some men to give an apparent assent to opinions which they do not in reality hold, it helps at the same time to keep one class of the people in a state of ignorant blindness, and to promote in another and more enlightened class a certain degree of scepticism, by the suspicion which it excites of the insincerity and unreality attending the profession of much of the popular faith. To you I need not, I am sure, present any arguments against the disingenuousness of such a practice. Frank, open, straightforward, manly dealing, demanded as it is of every one in his intercourse and transactions with the world, should especially mark the conduct and character of the Christian minister. Between what you profess with your lips and what you believe in your heart, there must be no incongruity, no inconsistency. Let your words be yea, yea, and nay, nay; and so, by manifestation of the truth, commend yourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God.

In the remarks which I have now made, I have aimed at offering a few suggestions, some of which may, possibly, not be altogether unworthy of your future consideration. It is not without a deep consciousness of my own shortcomings that I have placed the standard of ministerial duty and efficiency so high—higher, perhaps, you will say, than you can ever hope to attain. It may be so; but the act of striving after it, the very effort to approach it, will tend to make you stronger men, and to lift you up to a more elevated position than, without such efforts, you would have been able to reach. Remember that the ideal always transcends the actual. It is so in all other things as well as in this. The power of performing never equals the power of conceiving. We can seldom do all that we know. But this is no reason for not doing what we can. Enter, then, into the vineyard of your Lord; scatter abroad the seeds of divine truth; labour on in faith and hope; and may He who alone giveth the increase cause them to spring up and bring forth fruit abundantly! And, finally, may the Divine blessing accompany those of you who have not, as well as those who have, completed their course of study within these walls!

## M. RENAN ON THE RELIGIOUS FUTURE OF MODERN SOCIETIES.\*

3. Christianity has assumed in human societies three positions, which correspond nearly, though not rigorously, to the three families that history and race have formed. During the three hundred years of its first struggle, Christianity naturally demanded nothing from the State—it transacted its own affairs. Persecuted by the State, it triumphed by dint of patience, and obliged a peace which by a strange reaction was much more onerous to religion than to the State. It seems as if it were the nature of Christianity to be incapable of existing independent and tolerated. No sooner does it cease to be persecuted, than it becomes the religion of the State; and so powerfully organized was the Roman mechanism, that once religion became the religion of the State, it became a function of the State. After Constantine, in all parts of the world that followed the fate of the old empire, the Church was dominated by the State. The episcopal sees followed the divisions of the empire. The Bishop of Constantinople became the Pope of the East, because he had been the Court Bishop, just as though the Bishop of Versailles should have been made Primate of France.

The Greek Church, which represents this old Romano-Byzantine tradition, preserves this ineradicable mark, which Russia has inherited, for its Emperor is the absolute head of the Greek Church. Amongst the Christian communities subject to Turkey, by an inverse but logical phenomenon, the Church is become a civil profession; the patriarch is a civil as well as religious administrator named by the Sultan. Religion there is a nationality; rather, we should say, the formation of nationalities, in the sense we attach to the word, has become impossible in the East.

The West would, I imagine, have followed the same course, had the unity of the empire been maintained. The Byzantine world, in its decrepitude, is a complete picture of what the Western empire would have been but for the barbarians,—a world destitute of liberty and of the feeling of the Infinite; but the Germans, in breaking up the empire and founding separate kingdoms, created more favourable conditions for the Church. It being impossible for any of these kingdoms to pretend to represent the universal Church, they were led to conceive of the Church and State as two distinct things,—the Church embracing a higher circle than the State. The genius of the great Italian Popes of the 11th, 12th and 13th centuries, gave a stamp of great splendour to this system; to it the West owes its irrevocable primacy. The separation of the two powers was throughout the whole of the middle ages the condition of progress and the guarantee of a

---

\* Continued from p. 398.



certain measure of liberty. To appreciate its importance, we have only to look at Islamism, which not recognizing the distinction between civil and religious functions, the Mussulman world is doomed to die out. It never produced a John Chrysostom, a Gregory VII., nor a Thomas à Becket.

Some examples of resistance on the part of the Imans have been mentioned, but they never formed an independent body jealous of their privileges. Neither has a well-defined civil state, in opposition to the religious order, been ever constituted. If Turkey is now making but vain efforts to organize a system founded on an equality of rights, it is that she is struggling against a secular and fatal principle. Heir of the Khalifs, that is to say, vice-prophet, the Sultan could no more preside over a mixed state, where believers and unbelievers had the same privileges, than the Pope could, if half his subjects were Jews or Protestants, give them a place in the Roman congregations or the sacred college. The struggle between the Popes and the empire was in a great measure the fact that generated modern society. Theocracy and absolute despotism have been thus rendered impossible. If Islamism had had this salutary division, a monster like the Khalif Hakem might have been comparatively innocuous, and Arabic science might have escaped destruction by that worst of fanaticism, lay fanaticism. But we are not to suppose that the separation of the civil and religious powers that prevailed in the West during the middle ages was altogether a reign of liberty. The Latin Church, though much more independent than that of the East, was not more exempt than the other from one fatal evil, intolerance, the consequence of the extreme energy with which Christianity affirmed its divine truth. In destroying the old State religion of the Roman empire, Christianity substituted an absolute religion. Dignity of conscience gained by it; but violence hitherto unheard of was the consequence of this exaggerated dogmatism; and by a strange contradiction this religion, whose victory had been the triumph of conscience, was the religion that caused most bloodshed. The reason is simple: Roman despotism cared nothing about souls; its religion was a police regulation that in no wise affected philosophic liberty; whereas Christianity seeks to reach the soul—the outside does not satisfy it; it carries fire and sword into the regions of conscience—hence attacks of unparalleled vivacity. The Roman empire did not persecute one philosopher. The Christian middle ages stifled liberty of thought by unspeakable cruelties. Beings whom the Church holds up as models, appear to the eyes of impartial history as ruthless executioners. I shall not select as an example Philip II., who was a political as well as a religious tyrant—a true Domitian—but shall choose the best man that perhaps ever sat on a throne,—a true liberal, a sovereign who respected the rights of all, and whose goodness of

heart has never been surpassed. Saint Louis, in religious matters, was a persecutor. So convinced was he of the truth of his creed, that he laid it down as a principle that the layman should reply to the objections made against his faith by running his sword through the body of the man who made them.\* And he allowed, without the least scruple, the horrible Dominican Inquisition to decimate his subjects by "immuration" and the pyre *en permanence*. No tribunal under Domitian carried on such an odious persecution of the Christians as is prescribed in the *Directorium Inquisitorum* of Nicholas Eymeric.† No Roman proconsul ever wrote a poem like the "Novelle de l'Hérétique," by the inquisitor Izarn, in which each argument terminates with this menace: "If you will not believe, behold the fire kindled wherein your companions are burning;" or, "But already the fire and the torments are prepared through which you must pass." It is in this sense that it is permitted to say that theological persecution is the work of Christianity. Islamism, in one sense harsher, never seeks to convert. Its intolerance shews itself in disdain. The Mussulman will massacre the Christian in his moments of fury, but will not preach to him by offering the choice between its syllogisms and the pyre. Christianity, with its tenderness for souls, has created the type of a spiritual tyranny, and inaugurated in the world this dangerous idea, that man has a right over the opinions of his fellow-men. The Church did not become the State, but she compelled the State to persecute for her. If the secular arm executed the sentence, it was the priest pronounced it.

While treating with horror the persecutions under the Empire which were not carried on in the name of truth, Christianity itself in the middle ages was in reality an armed, imperious, violent religion, permitting no discussion. Such a system might be better for the general morality of mankind than the Roman system, in which religion was a function of the State, or than the Mussulman system, in which the State and religion are identical; but it was in fact the most cruel of all. It made Latin Europe of the 13th and 14th centuries one field of torture; it was in flagrant contradiction with the pure principles of the gospel; and when in the 16th century a protestation burst forth from the heart of Christianity itself, a third type of Christian society was formed, aiming at a revival of primitive liberty. This aspiration was not then to be realized. Protestantism, besides the many acts of violence it was itself guilty of, seemed to revert towards ideas less pure upon the relations of Church and

---

\* See Joinville.

† The authentic acts of these horrors, before which pale those of the revolutionary tribunal, are still for the most part unpublished. The examinations before the Inquisition of Toulouse were published by Limborche; those before the Inquisition of Carcassonne are in the Imperial Library.

State. Lutheranism placed theology in the hands of the German princes. Calvinism, in its ideal city of Geneva, based the republic upon religion. In England and Sweden, official reform issued in national churches absolutely dependent upon the civil power. Nevertheless, the new principle which was the hidden soul of the movement, the idea of free Christianity, gradually took shape. The Nonconformists, who were almost as violently persecuted by the official Protestant churches as they would have been by the Catholics, maintained and propagated this idea with admirable tenacity. In our day, it reigns and triumphs in every portion of the Protestant world. A multitude of churches, having no tie with any central Church or with the State, exist and fructify. In America, this system forms part of the constitution. Thus, after three centuries of hesitation, Protestantism has at last realized the programme whose accomplishment it too prematurely announced. It has actually come back to the liberty of the early Christian times, all trace of which disappeared the day Constantine began to occupy himself with theology. A free Church, as it existed during the first three centuries, and as it does at present in America—a Church dependent on the State, as in Russia and Sweden—a Church separate from the State, with Rome for its centre, and treating with the State as potentate with potentate, as in Catholic countries—such are the three forms under which Christianity is brought into contact with human society. Let us examine which of these three forms is most likely to assimilate best with the tendency of modern thought towards an ideal of liberty, of mildness of manners, of intellectual development and of morality. We must unquestionably place lowest on the list the system which makes religion a function of the State. The effects of this system are varied according to the quality of the government to which the Church is subject. Advantageous enough in countries where the government is limited, it is fatal in despotic countries. In Russia, it has produced the extreme consequences of depression and servility. The Russian Church, humiliated, miserably recruited, and without any apparent germ of progress, drags on in the lowest stage of Christianity, almost at its last limit. No distinguished man can be cited who has sprung from the Russian Church. In Sweden, the Church of the State is characterized by extreme intolerance and utter mediocrity. In England, the official Church, after having been guilty of most odious persecutions during the latter end of the 16th century and all through the 17th, has long since reached a state of harmless nullity. Routine and abuses there reign in perfect quietude. Oxford, until the remarkable movement of late years, vied with Rome in the total absence of all spirit of criticism, and the obstinacy with which it clung to the past. Happily, the germs of a far brighter future are visible here and there; and besides,—and this is an immense merit, without ex-



ample and without parallel,—this official, this opulent Church, patronized by the State and uniting the suffrages of the majority, no longer persecutes Dissenters, and presents no obstacle to liberty! In the small German principalities, the dependent position of the Church, after having produced in the 17th century a somewhat languid intellectual development, has achieved, later on, excellent results. Thanks to the profundity of German genius, and to the remarkable intelligence of the German princes of the latter part of the last century and of the beginning of this, and thanks, perhaps, also to those rich speculative faculties which Germany seems to pay for in the loss of her political influence, theological teaching in the German universities has attained a height and freedom of which we have no example in any preceding century. The division of Germany, which made her Protestant, has borne its usual fruit; in creating rivalry, it created light and liberty. But this is an exceptional case, and no inference can be drawn from it. As a general rule, the subordination of the Church to the State is bad, and opposed to the true wants of the modern mind. In France, above all, it would be fatal; and I regard as a serious error the opinion of some very sound thinkers who seek in this direction the solution of ever-growing difficulties. The Gallican Church of Pierre Pithou would have had all the defects of the Anglican Church, without, perhaps, its qualities. The general object of petitions addressed to the king by the assemblies of the clergy of France, was to solicit acts of intolerance. I have no doubt that in our time a Gallican Church dependent on the State would weigh much heavier on liberty than does the Church dependent on Rome. Better have a Pope than a theologian Emperor at Byzantine or Moscow. Let us not forget these proud words—"I intended to exalt the Pope to the highest pitch, to surround him with pomp and homage. I would have led him to no longer regret his temporal power, and would have made an idol of him. He should have remained near me. Paris would have become the capital of the Christian world, and I should have directed the religious as well as the political world. It would have been a means of binding together all the federative parts of the Empire, and of imposing peace on those beyond its limits. I should have had my religious sessions as I had my legislative sessions. My councils would have represented Christendom, the Popes being but the presidents. I should have opened and closed these assemblies, approved their decisions, as did Constantine and Charlemagne."

I know no graver danger than the one implied in this programme. Countries where the administration is most centralized, are those where a national Church produces most fatal results. Pius V. and Philip II. did not arrest modern thought; administrative despotism does arrest it. The latter does not need to be violent. Brutalities such as those that were committed in Judea

in the time of Pontius Pilate, at Rome under Nero, and in Europe in the 16th century, are no longer to be dreaded. And yet the liberty that the foundation of Christianity and the Reformation implies, no longer exists: simple *police correctionnelle* regulations render these great apparitions impossible. M. Michelet has already pointed out how much more effectual is the persecution of those adroit administrators of the Colbert school, how much deeper it strikes into the heart of its victims, than did the clumsy cruelty of the Spanish Inquisition. When the State lays its hand upon conscience, its hand is heavier than the priests. The priest cannot prevent the first expression of truth; while the State, with its prudent mildness and its preventive system, can stop all great initiative. I do not know one single life of a saint, or of any great man of the past, which in our day would not be a perpetual infraction of the law. Our laws upon the illegal exercise of medicine, upon public meetings, upon preliminary authorization in matters of worship, would have stifled in their birth the two or three great events to which the world owes its life and progress. France is proud of her *concordat*; and effectually the *concordat* is the last word of the revolution in the religious order of things, as the *code civil* is its last word in the political order. It bears the character of everything that originated in the revolution: essentially administrative, it evinces a remarkable comprehension of all that constitutes the force and peace of a nation; but at the same time, a singular oblivion of liberty, little respect for individual conscience, and a complete ignoring of the moral side of man. The *concordat* may be resumed in the words attributed to Portalis—"To regulate superstition and bring it within bounds." The mistake of France is, in general, that it believes that the free spontaneity of souls may be replaced by well-combined institutions. A frightful barbarism, "*moraliser*," to moralize, is become a French word. Setting out from the idea that a nation is happy if it has a good code and a good administration,—allowing the individual but one right, that of amusing himself at his ease,—without ideas, without opinions, without anything that can disturb a vulgar felicity,—politicians who draw extreme consequences from the revolution, look on religious convictions as an inevitable evil which must be restrained and legalized by wise regulations. But there is too much fire in the blood of humanity to allow it to rest satisfied with the ignoble Eden of a happy citizen *bourgeois*, amusing himself by fits and starts, living and dying from mere habit, and believing by decree. Religious sentiment will vindicate itself; the different creeds will rather choose the dangers of liberty than a protection obtained by the detriment of what they most value,—the right of discussion and of believing that they must depend upon themselves and upon truth. To sum up, it appears to us that the system of national churches has not a long career before

it. The narrow conception of truth it implies, is opposed to the tendency of the French mind towards a universal ideal, common to all. It requires the patriotic optimism of the Englishman to believe that the Church of his island is the best, because it is his. The religious sentiment is not bounded by rivers or mountains. A central administration, such as that of Rome, would be more accessible to certain ideas of progress, than small churches if dominated by the spirit of routine. Rome, until the 18th century, played the part in the Catholic world of a much more enlightened capital than did her provinces. Béranger, Abelard, Roger Bacon, found more encouragement and toleration from the Papacy than they experienced at the hands of the local ecclesiastical authorities. No local church contributed to the revival of letters in the degree that the Papacy did during the 15th and 16th centuries. What a period was that when the discovery of a Latin author was a stepping-stone to the tiara or to a Cardinal's hat! Let us consider what incomparable largeness of mind was possessed by such Popes as Thomas de Sarzane, Æneas Sylvius, Julius II., Leo X., and by the apostolic secretaries, Le Pogge, Leonardo Bruni, Bembo, Sandolet! In the 18th century, no national church possessed a Benedict XIV., the correspondent of Voltaire, a Clement XIV., a Passionei, a Stephen Borgia. The Papacy benefiting by the rare intellectual qualities of the Italian mind, its tact, its adroitness, its practical knowledge of life, had a more extensive horizon than any local church. If all this is now at an end, it is that Papal Rome is no longer an Italian centre. French, Belgian, Irish Neo-catholics, give the tone and speak a language that would be unintelligible to the Maï, the La Somaglia.

Because the Catholic system is preferable to that of national churches dependent on the State, are we hence to conclude that this system represents in religion the ideal of our time? Certainly not. The ultramontane notion of a religious power centralized in one capital, possessing this capital and the depending provinces in entire sovereignty, treating with kingdoms, as potentate with potentates, over the heads of the local clergy, involves, in my opinion, difficulties which must be manifest. The inevitable logic of things has forced Catholicism more and more to strengthen its centre, to make all power flow back thither. More than ever are Catholics taught to believe that from Rome they receive life and salvation; and it is a remarkable fact that it is the new conquests of Catholicism that on this point are the most sensitive. The old provincial Catholic whose faith is ancestral, needs less the Pope, and is less alarmed at the storms which threaten him, than is the Neo-catholic who, in coming back to Catholicism, looks on the Pope, according to the new system, as the author and guarantee of his faith. A species of lamaïsm, or faith in a perpetual incarnation of the truth, is thus growing



up. By a singular coincidence, the most powerful auxiliary of these modern exaggerations was he who appeared to be their most formidable opponent. The idea that the Pope is in the Church what the Emperor is in the State, that he administers the Church through the bishops as the Emperor administers the State through his prefects, that to treat with him is to treat with the Church, as to treat with the Emperor is to treat with the State,—this idea is the idea of Napoleon and the basis of the concordat. Had Gregory VII. been asked if he believed he possessed the necessary powers to blot out with a stroke of his pen a whole church, and re-construct it next day according to the views of a temporal sovereign, he would have replied in the negative. The theologians of what is called the *petite église*, produced on this question invincible arguments. The concordat is an unparalleled fact in the history of the Church, and the most enormous act of ultramontaniam the Papacy ever permitted itself. The bishop who in the old canonic institutions held his power by right divine, is no more than a prefect, revocable, for the well-being of the community, even though blameless. The Pope that in the ancient church possessed but a vaguely-defined primacy, became general administrator of the church. The constitution of the dioceses as separate churches is profoundly modified; the whole framework may be changed when it pleases the supreme administrator; they have only a factitious existence, like a department. The administrative system of France thus made a complete invasion of the Church. The Pope became absolute sovereign of the Church; all the rights which according to the old constitution were diffused through the whole ecclesiastical body, were concentrated in his hands.

The dangers of such an organization are easy to be seen. Experience has proved that centralized powers are the least stable, a *coup de main* sufficing to overthrow them. Changes in such governments are only to be effected by revolutions. With centralization, instability and revolution found their way into the Church. The Pope is more vulnerable than a widely-diffused church; besides, the Pope being brought by the system of the concordats into direct relation with governments, religion is brought down into the sphere of terrestrial things and mixed up with worldly intrigues,—its representative no longer the pontiff, the saint, the scholar, but personified in a diplomatist.

The Popes of the first half of the middle ages were no doubt much mixed up in worldly questions, but they then took the leading part. Deprived of this supremacy since the 14th century, and representing a second or third-rate power, the Pope in modern times is reduced to have recourse to human means but little worthy of his office. Catholicism has in this way developed into an essentially political religion: the Jesuits who drew up its code of diplomacy have alone shewn a comprehension of the re-

quirements of its position and the line of conduct to which it is condemned. Prejudicial to religion, the ultramontane organization is not less so to the State. It is no superficial prejudice which has placed in some countries the words *Catholics* and *Patriots* in opposition, and made them the rallying cry of hostile parties: Catholicism is more the country of the believer than his own fatherland. The intenser the religion, the more it produces this result. Islamism in the East has completely effaced the idea of country. Though Europe is not exposed to the same danger, yet it cannot be denied that ultramontane Catholicism creates many embarrassments to civil society. Religion, in the ultramontane system, though a distinct power, yet wielding as it does terrestrial means,—states are forced to make perpetual concessions to it, and those concessions are invariably a diminution of public liberty. Taking her stand as a power by divine right, to whom obedience is due even by those who do not profess it, the Church feels herself persecuted when not dominant, while in reality she enjoys enormous privileges which she owes to her haughty demeanour. The bishop complains that he has not the full measure of liberty he would desire in publishing his circulars. I join him in his crusade; but why should not the bishop extend the same liberty to the free-thinker? Why does he demand of the State that opinions differing from his shall be excluded from public instruction? If the bishop interferes with the State, let him not be surprised that the State should interfere with him. If he requires of the State that nothing contrary to his opinions shall be spoken from the public pulpits, let him not take it ill that the State should revise his circulars in order that nothing contrary to its policy be found in them. It is hardly natural that the clergy should receive their Papal bulls through a diplomatic agent; but we must bear in mind the Pope is a sovereign and his nuncios ambassadors. It is absurd that the State should force the priest to sing a *Te Deum*, and prosecute him if he refuse to pray; but we must not forget that the priest owes the State one great privilege,—that his power, wealth, his authority in the past and what may yet survive of it, he owes directly or indirectly to the State, which for centuries has secured to him an exclusive monopoly. Be free, but let all partake of freedom! Do not require the State to declare that you possess the truth; defend yourself without invoking the State against your adversaries. Ask of it but one thing, that to which all have a right, the liberty of believing what appears to you true, and making others share your convictions by fair and equitable means. This, I know, is an impossible act of abnegation. Catholicism, persuaded that it is labouring in the cause of truth, will always endeavour to make the State aid its defence or its propagandism. The inevitable consequence of the ultramontane system, is the formation of a *Catholic party* whose principle is

to employ its influence in the interest of the Church, and who support or attack governments according as they serve or do not serve their religion. The history of this party extends over nearly half a century, and it has not been wanting in either talent or skill. The word liberty is ever on its lips; but can we say that this great word has been its rule of conduct? The admirable resolutions of toleration it made during its season of weakness, were they kept when victory was on its side? When the Catholic party attained a very influential position during the two or three years subsequent to the revolution of '48, did they treat their adversaries with much consideration? The laws they voted, did they think they might one day be applied to themselves? The Austrian concordat and that of the Grand Duchy of Baden, which were their work, did they favour liberty? He who approved of the revolt of Belgium against Holland, of the separation of Ireland, what does he say of the insurrection of the Romagna? Nevertheless, it is certain that the treaties of 1815 were as much violated in the one instance as in the other. He very properly abhors *la terreur*, still he is the apologist of Pius V. and of the order of Saint Dominick. He raises his voice against tyranny, but does he blame the Church for having allied itself with every despot that served it, from Philip II. down to some nameless president of one of the American republics? We are assured that henceforth it will not be so. Heaven grant it! In all cases it matters little to us; each man's liberty is in his own hands, not in another's. We may wish for others the measure of liberty we desire for ourselves, but must only count on ourselves for the liberty we want, and to which every man has a right.

Another peculiar circumstance complicates these difficulties: like all centralized states, ultramontane Catholicism must have a capital. A certain portion of the surface of the earth must be withdrawn from all the conditions of national life, to serve as territory for its administration and as a seat for its sovereign. In this respect the superiority of Protestantism is immense. The unity of Protestantism is altogether spiritual; it wants not an inch of territory wherein to establish its centre. Not even a tenth-rate village does the Protestant need for the tranquillity of his conscience. His peace of mind does not depend on his communion with his priest, but on his faith in his Bible, and ultimately on the pure idea of Christ: the conscience of the Protestant is thus secure from revolutions and the hazards of history. This complete abstraction from space—this absolute spiritualism, admitting no link with any terrestrial spot—is impossible to the ultramontane Catholic. He cannot get on without his material establishment. He must have his patrimony, his army, his revenue, his diplomacy, his policy. He enters fully into the current of temporal things, and must therefore be sub-



ject to their conditions. He builds on the volcanic soil of our planet, and must be prepared for the shocks. For ultramontanism to be able to promise itself that its destiny would be eternal, it should first have made sure that the corner of earth on which it built its holy city could never be shaken, and that the people it had appropriated to itself would not only remain Catholic, but would never claim their right of living as other nations live. It should have a city in the clouds, up in some inaccessible peak where no contagion of ideas could reach it. Let us examine if the country which, by virtue of very subtle theological deductions, and still more for reasons of historical necessity of the first order, Catholicism has made its headquarters, unites these conditions. This country is Italy. And a happy choice it was for Catholicism; whilst Italy on her side gained thereby a brilliant and peculiar destiny, which has only become a burthen and a cause of inferiority to her since the revolution wrought such changes in the courses of the world; but fifty years ago four cardinal facts were introduced into the European order of things, which render the sequestration of Italy difficult to maintain, and this sequestration is an essential condition of the old organization of the Papacy. These four facts are—the importance attached to the principle of nationalities; the exclusive preponderance arrogated to themselves by the great powers of Europe; the profound transformation that the Papacy itself has undergone; the revolution which without distinction of sect has taken place in the religious sentiment.

There may be exaggeration in the different applications of the right of nationalities which it is the tendency of our day to make; but the principle of territorial divisions founded on nature and the affinities of race, tends to replace the old divisions based on the arbitrary convenience of princes. Now the grandeur of the Papacy just consists in being above and beyond nationalities—in being a *universal* machine—consequently, in requiring the sacrifice of the nationality of the soil it occupies. If the Pope is Italian, he will not be Catholic; if he is Catholic, he will not be Italian. And here the logic of history is inflexible; it shews, with a clearness evident to all minds capable of general views, the Papacy, from the time of the Lombards, opposing an impassable barrier to the formation of a kingdom of Italy. Contemporary events I shall not touch, their character being as yet undefined and their consequences impossible to foresee. It is the glory of the Roman Church to despise passing storms. I shall admit, if necessary, that the struggle for an Italian nationality, even under the most mitigated form, is destined to a series of defeats, and that again ten times shall Peter, strong in the support of the Catholic world, tread on vipers and serpents; but I see clearly that each of these victories will be fatal to him, that they will deepen the gulf in which the Vatican will one day be

swallowed up ; for institutions die out, but a people never. Institutions perish by their victories, and a people triumph by their defeats. A mortal duel is being fought, in which one of the combatants cannot die, though it be the feeblest and the one oftenest thrown. The inevitable consequence is that the other must die. Each effort to stifle his enemy costs the Papacy compromises, pledges, compacts, that in the long-run will be fatal to it, and which will take from it the last atom of independence that it pretended to base upon the possession of a small principality. Here a much more formidable difficulty rises up against a temporal Papacy than that which results from the waking up of national instincts. The independence of the Papacy was sufficiently guaranteed by its sovereignty over three or four millions at a period when small states were something. When the republic of Venice was respected by Europe, when it could resist a king of France, then the sovereign of Rome and Bologna was in the temporal hierarchy a considerable personage independent of his religious prestige. But all this is changed since four or five great agglomerations have monopolized to themselves the management of European affairs. In this state of things it is easy to see what must be the position of petty sovereigns. If it may be said (and some restrictions may here be necessary) that for the four or five great powers sovereignty is synonymous with independence, it is equally certain that the petty sovereign is the most dependent of men. What is to be said when the petty sovereign is in a state of hostility with his subjects? In this case he depends on the nation that guards him, or on the nation upon which he trusts for support against that which guards him. Better be the free subject of one power than thus be under alternate obligations to all. The formation of a Catholic army is no solution of the difficulty. A Catholic army would fail, as all chivalry would, in our leaden age, before the will of the masses. Prussia, with her sixteen millions of inhabitants and her military institutions, is hardly able to make any figure amongst the great powers. She occupies in the European concert a somewhat embarrassing position. If Popedom could create an army like France or a fleet like England, nothing could be said ; but we all know such colossal apparatus can only be maintained by the national principle. I may add, too, that the clever Roman party which, counting little on miracles, has always courted organized forces much more than it has sought the support of religious enthusiasm, would not trust a Catholic army, but would neutralize its effect, and would turn in preference to diplomacy. By the fatality of events, the Pope would thus be reduced to demand of the great powers to guarantee him his dominions. He would have to watch the chances of success, and to sink himself deeper and deeper into the labyrinth of human calculations. So that it is not on his small principality that he

can build his independence; on the contrary, it is his principality that nails him to the earth, and that brings him before the tribunal of the European powers, where schism and heresy compose the majority.

I shall add, also, that legitimacy, another great principle of force, cannot here be invoked. Legitimacy is founded on a kind of immemorial union between a royal house and a nation, —the royal house pledging itself to a strict succession, and renouncing all private interest opposed to that of the nation; but here is no hereditary house, no national interests. The Papacy can no more claim the rights of a dynasty than could the Doge of Venice, and the interests it represents have long ceased to have anything in common with the country on whose surface it reigns, but without any view to which it governs. Charged with a universal mission, the Pope would fail in his duty, as the common father of the faithful, were he only to consider the interest of his little principality; in other words, were he a good sovereign. The exaggerated idea now entertained of the spiritual and temporal sovereignty of the Pope, swells this difficulty out into immense proportions. Italy abided by the Papacy as long as the Papacy was Italian, and left it the government it was attached to, namely, municipal government. Had the 18th century endeavoured to rob Italy of her Papacy, it would have defended it to its last breath; but circumstances are irrevocably changed. On one side the Papacy is becoming more and more a Catholic administration, in which foreigners possess most influence; on the other, a narrow idea of direct and administrative sovereignty has replaced at Rome the old one of suzerainty which made the Pope's position more dignified and fitting. By a false calculation, whose consequences will be long felt, Consalvi had the principle adopted that the Pope's sovereignty over the states, restored to him in 1815, should be a complete sovereignty analogous to that of the king of France, and involving the abolition of the ancient franchises. This was an enormous usurpation; for, in 1796, Bologna was substantially a republic, having no tie to Rome but that of a nominal vassality. However, it was the error of the time; for it would seem that in overthrowing the empire there was a studied endeavour to continue everywhere with as much rigour and less splendour the system of government inaugurated by the empire.

The Napoleonien idea of sovereignty was made, in 1815, the basis of European public right. Germany retained its petty princes as absolute sovereigns; the Restoration retained the prefectoral administration; the Pope and Sultan were declared absolute kings of the countries marked out on the map for them. The consequences for Rome and Constantinople were alike. In one, it resulted in the massacre of the Christians; in the other, in the revolution of the Roman states, and notably of the Romagna.



The Pope cannot possibly be a good administrator; nor is this a reproach to him. The government of human society is reduced to details so mean and paltry that the old majesty of Rome could not be otherwise than compromised. The Pope of former times escaped this responsibility by the vaguely-defined nature of his power; for the Pope of the 19th century there is but one escape, that of accepting a constitutional form of government. This he refuses, and in justice, let us ask ourselves, could he have accepted it? I am far from underrating what is generous in an attempt in which noble hearts have spent their strength; yet I must confess (and I should like to find my apprehension prove groundless) that the hypothesis of a parliamentary Papacy in matters temporal seems hard to realize. In many respects this hypothesis is in contradiction with the essential principles, not of the ideal Papacy, but of the exaggerated Papacy which is the result of modern ultramontane maxims. I can well conceive the Pope feudal suzerain of moderately free provinces or protector of small republics; but I cannot conceive a constitutional Pope, with the usual accompaniment of a central representation. This priest whom we must make a sovereign in order that he be not subordinate to other sovereigns, is it not to be feared that he may become subordinate to his own subjects? The Catholic, whose conscience revolts at the idea that he who represents truth in his eyes should suffer constraint from without,—would not his conscience revolt much more to see his infallible, immaculate chief depend on a profane chamber and bend before the will of his cabinet? In fine, religion in our time aspiring more and more to make the soul its temple, truly religious persons will feel a deep-rooted antagonism to this fatal attachment to worldly things implied in this new ultramontane system; they will end in seeing want of faith in this perpetual distrust of the virtue of Divine aid. There are independencies altogether human that know how to maintain themselves without possessing an inch of earth; and why should not he who is assisted by strength and light from above have equal courage? A false idea of sovereignty is at the bottom of the opinions expressed by Catholics on this subject: they set out by supposing a man cannot be at the same time free and a subject, that a sovereign is necessarily a Louis XIV., master of bodies and souls. Let Catholics join with us in the endeavour that it be so no longer. Instead of founding the independence of faith on walls of stone, let them labour to conquer liberty for all, and to put an end to the rights of the State over things of the mind. Let the Pope's action be confined to purely religious interests; in this field no government would interfere with him. The confession of Augsburg wants no sovereign representative; it is maintained and preserved by the common faith of its adherents.

(To be concluded in the next No.)

AN ACCOUNT OF SOME BOOKS RECENTLY TRANSMITTED FROM  
CLAUSENBURG BY THE TRANSYLVANIAN UNITARIANS TO THE  
PRINCIPAL OF MANCHESTER NEW COLLEGE, LONDON.

SIR,

ONE fruit of the intercourse which we have opened with our Unitarian brethren in Transylvania, has been the present of a parcel of books which I have just received, and of which I proceed to give your readers some account. With the exception of one, they are all in the Magyar language; but by the help of my friend and pupil, Mr. Dominic Simén, now a student in Manchester New College, I am able to give you their titles and tables of contents in English, which may serve to convey some idea of the state of religious thought and feeling in Transylvania.

1. The first of these works is in Latin: *Summa Universæ Theologiæ Christianæ secundum Unitarios, in usum Auditorum Theologiæ concinnata et edita. Claudiopoli: Typis Collegii Reformatorum, 1787.* This Manual is already known in this country. There are two copies of it in the library of Manchester New College, one of them presented, in 1845, by Mr. Stephen Kovács, of Transylvania. In its present form of the aforesaid date, it is a revised edition of a work put forth in the earlier part of the last century by Michael Lombárd de Szent Abrahám, who was Superintendent or Bishop of the Unitarian churches in Transylvania from 1737 to 1758. The new edition is preceded by an Address to the Reader from the Unitarian Consistory, in which they state that it was mainly designed for the use of students of theology, and as an authentic statement of the articles of religious belief, so often misunderstood, actually held by the Unitarians. The work was undertaken in consequence of an imperial rescript, dated Vienna, October 30, 1782, which granted permission to print the devotional and doctrinal books of Protestants throughout the provinces subject to the imperial rule. The emperor of Germany was king of Hungary and prince of Transylvania. On a fly-leaf of the copy presented to the Manchester New College library, Mr. Kovács has transcribed entire from the original autograph forwarded to the Royal Administration in Transylvania, the rescript which authorized the printing of the "Summa Theologiæ," and which bears a remarkable testimony to the liberal spirit of the emperor Joseph II. I translate it here word for word from the German :

"To the Royal Administration in Transylvania: The manuscript entitled, 'Summa Universæ Theologiæ Christianæ secundum Unitarios,' accompanied by a notice from the Royal Administration under date of the 23rd of November of last year, and of the 26th of March of the present year, is sent back to the Royal Administration with the observation, that the printing of the same is the more to be allowed as, in addition to the fact that this religion is received (i.e. recognized) in Transylvania,

the Manual, for the modesty which distinguishes it, may serve as a model for other religious writings (*zum Muster dienen kann*). Vienna, April 13, 1785.

“(Signed)

CHARLES, COUNT PALFY.”

To this is subjoined :

“Ad benignum Sacræ Cæsareæ et Regio-Apostolicæ Majestatis mandatum.

“(Signed)

FERDINANDUS SCULTETY.”

In the same volume, already referred to, is a copy of the “Confessio Fidei Christianæ secundum Unitarios, inter quatuor in Transylvania Religiones receptas numerata, Fundamentalibus Patriæ istius Legibus, Diplomatis, variisque Rescriptis CÆSAREIS, verbis REGIS, Capitulationibus PRINCIPUM approbata, confirmata.” The several articles of this Confession are accompanied by scriptural proofs in the margin; and the tone of the whole, without relinquishing its fundamental doctrine, has been studiously assimilated to the language of orthodoxy. At the end of the Confession, the final appeal is made to holy scripture—“tanquam normam credendorum, sperandorum, et faciendorum.” Of the Old and New Testaments, the Confession says—“toto corde amplectimur et ore profitemur;” and of the Apostles’ Creed—“summa prosequimur veneratione.” Should any one affirm that the Unitarians hold any other belief than this, they are prepared to shew that he is deceived and a deceiver. The original date of this Confession is not given; but the oldest document cited in it is of March 13, 1713. It was reprinted by order of the Royal Administration, December 27, 1782.

I am rather wandering from my proposed object; but as all these documents are contained in our copy of the “Summa Theologiæ,” and are in themselves interesting, I thought I might take this opportunity of noticing them.

The “Summa Theologiæ,” after an Introduction on Holy Scripture as “Theologiæ Norma,” is divided into four parts: of which the first treats of God, his attributes, creation, providence, and covenant with man; the second, of Christ, the Mediator of the New Covenant, his person and offices, especially his prophetic, priestly and kingly office; the third, of Christian Ethics, or the conditions of the Christian Religion, including the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, of Sins and Duties, and the sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist; the fourth, of the Church, its ministry, membership and government. Each head is treated with great fulness, accompanied by copious references to Scripture, and in a clear and simple style. The characteristic tenet of the old Transylvanian Unitarianism, represented by Davidis, is softened down in this manual, which more nearly approaches the proper Socinian type of doctrine. The article on the worship of Christ (§ lxxx.) is thus expressed: “Homo Jesus Christus, qui est Filius Dei et Dominus omnium, Divino cultu honorandus est.



Joan. v. 22, 23; Act. vii. 55; coll. vers. 58; Apoc. v. 8—13. Qui honor consistit in ejus adoratione, et invocatione, cum gratiarum actione conjuncta." Again (§ lxxxv.): "Deum colimus tanquam Eum, ex quo omnia, Christum Dominum, per quem omnia; etsi enim eoientes Christum Mediatorem, ut Dei Legatum, colamus Patrem quoque, iste tamen cultus, qui in Patre terminatur, diversus est ab eo, quo Christum prosequimur."

The spirit of the Introduction is that of Episcopus, from whose "Confessio Remonstrantium" a considerable extract is quoted. On the final authority in religion, nothing can be more clear and admirable than the doctrine of this Manual.

"If you prefer the judgment of another to the conviction of your own conscience, you can never be certain of any truth; for how shall you get at another man's conscience and sincerity? Matt. vii. 15. Should you appeal from your own conscience to any judge whatever, he must first be satisfied in his own conscience, nor may you accept his judgment, before your conscience has told you, you should acquiesce in it; for what cannot be demonstrated to conscience, neither can nor ought to be received; wherefore controversies must be resolved at last into each man's private conscience and judgment (§ l.). And these remarks do not lead to a rash and arrogant rejection of any pious and probable interpretations, whether of the ancients or of the moderns, but simply to this, that when conscience informs us they adduce something at variance with the true sense of scripture, we must dissent from them, only with modesty; for such men are not exempt from the lot of humanity, and therefore liable to error (§ li.). Nor must we here understand by reason, what seems to any particular individual to be rational, but *sound reason*, which is, when we have so clear and distinct a conception as precludes all doubt, and we judge not from opinion, conjecture, prejudice or the conclusions of others, but from the very light of conscience given and kindled by God" (§ lii.).

The concluding words of the Manual are touching, and not yet, unhappily, out of place:

"All their studies are directed to this end, that they may be able to pursue and promote that saving truth which it concerns all to know, and which leads to solid piety, the salvation of individuals, the peace and concord of all. Wherefore we beseech thee, Christian reader, with fraternal earnestness, do not admit all sorts of accusations, calumnies and disparaging judgments against us, nor too easily lend thine ear to the language of those men who make it their business to bring the professors of the Unitarian religion into disrepute; rather, if perchance thou perceivest them to be in error, instruct them in the spirit of meekness. To one who can teach them a better way, and to that divine truth which is to them more precious than anything else, they are ever ready to yield."

The "Summa Theologiæ," independently of its intrinsic merits, possesses great historical interest, as a record of the belief of a small body of Christians, who, in a remote corner of Europe, through long centuries of oppression and persecution, have

clung to the doctrines of their forefathers, and have bravely brought down to the present day their faith in the simple unity of God from the first age of the Reformation. The open profession of Unitarianism, which among us is a comparative novelty, is with them a venerable tradition, hallowed by the memories of illustrious ancestors. This striking contrast between their position and ours, would alone suffice to make their religious literature exceedingly interesting. But the "Summa" is in itself a good book, at once scriptural and argumentative, exhibiting an excellent *coup d'œil* of the whole range of Christian theology from the Unitarian point of view, and, from its copious citation of scriptural authorities under each head, affording even now valuable assistance to the student in the prosecution of doctrinal inquiries. A large portion of the original impression is still undisposed of, some thousand copies remaining in the library at Clausenburg. Should there be a wish in this country to possess any of them, I have no doubt that our Transylvanian friends would be glad to send as many as were desired, in consideration of more recent works in theology being forwarded to them. In return for the parcel just received, it is proposed shortly to send them a number of recent English publications. I have written enough on this subject for one letter. What I have to add on the Magyar works, must be reserved for a future communication.

*London, July 16, 1861.*

JOHN JAMES TAYLER.

---

#### CHARACTER OF GEORGE THE THIRD.

DURING the twenty-three years which had followed his accession, he had not been loved by his subjects. His domestic virtues were acknowledged. But it was generally thought that the good qualities by which he was distinguished in private life were wanting to his political character. As a sovereign, he was resentful, unforgiving, stubborn, cunning. Under his rule the country had sustained cruel disgraces and disasters; and every one of those disgraces and disasters was imputed to his strong antipathies, and to his perverse obstinacy in the wrong. One statesman after another complained that he had been induced by royal caresses, entreaties and promises, to undertake the direction of affairs at a difficult conjuncture, and that, as soon as he had, not without sullyng his fame and alienating his best friends, served the turn for which he was wanted, his ungrateful master began to intrigue against him and to canvass against him. Grenville, Rockingham, Chatham, men of widely different characters, but all three upright and high-spirited, agreed in thinking that the Prince under whom they had successively held the highest place in the government was one of the most insincere of mankind.—*Lord Macaulay.*

## CRITICAL NOTICES.

*Personal Duties and Social Relations. A Volume of Discourses on Christian Conduct and Character.* By the late Joseph Hutton, LL. D. Edited, with a Prefatory Sketch of the Author, by his Son, Joseph Henry Hutton, B.A. Pp. 299. London—Whitfield. 1861.

No minister in the Unitarian denomination left behind him a more distinct or a more favourable impression than the late Dr. Hutton. The moral impression was probably deeper and bolder than the intellectual. It was impossible to converse with him, however casually, without perceiving that he was a man naturally gifted, and whose moral tastes were refined by the purest cultivation. His moral susceptibilities were delicate and tender. His sympathies, naturally large, were extended by the influence of religion to the widest catholicity. His emotions often surpassed his powers of utterance; and the faltering tongue, while it disclosed, partially concealed, the depth of his feelings. A man more real and sterling we never knew. Even on questions which called forth opinions different from those of some of his friends, his decisions always carried their respect where they failed to win their assent. No man for a moment doubted his honesty of purpose and integrity of practice. He was fearless in uttering, when necessary, his dissent from those he habitually acted with; but their difference of opinion and practice never cast a momentary shade on his personal regard for them. He was happy in winning the affectionate esteem of men of all parties and every shade of opinion. His intellectual powers were nicely balanced; they were sound rather than original, and active without being markedly vigorous. They who listened to him in the unreserved interchange of thought and feeling in society, and heard him pouring forth from a full memory and a chastened taste a succession of pleasing and instructive remarks, would little realize the difficulties which beset him when he endeavoured to record with the pen his opinions or feelings.

“Oratory was neither his *forte* nor his fault. Not that he was not, at times, eloquent; but fluency and inspiration came to him but rarely, and only in the retirement of his study. There, his subject would, not unfrequently, kindle him into real eloquence, as may be seen especially in the three sermons on Patriotism, and that on Free Trade, which is now published for the second time.

“Still, he was not a preacher by nature. Great speakers and preachers, have always felt themselves at home in presence of a multitude; have always felt, that they could command attention, and more or less sway the minds before them, as the wind bends the trees; whereas, all who knew my father, knew how keen was his dread of public speaking, how great was his hatred of the platform. He always prefaced any address that he was called upon to make, (and the occasions, of course, did often occur, to one holding his position in the Unitarian body,) with the words, ‘My friends know that I dislike public speaking;’ or, ‘You know that I have no gift of eloquence.’ In truth, though an Irishman, in some respects, by temperament, as well as by birth, he had a great deal of nervous, English shyness and reserve, and always felt, that an audience put a sudden stop to the natural flow of his ideas, and consequently, checked speech, instead of awakening and rousing his powers of utterance.

“But more than this, my father was usually a very slow writer, and almost



always laboured at his sermon, under much anxiety and depression of spirits. Well can his children remember the painful Saturdays, that cast the heavy, and often the sole gloom, of the week, upon the cheerful light of their home. Week after week, have we found him, walking to and fro in his study, with the pen between his lips, and the frown of anxious thought upon his brow, till we learnt to dread the day, because of the anxiety associated with it in our minds. Nay, so laborious generally was writing to him, partly from fastidiousness of taste, and partly from the natural slowness with which he expressed his thoughts, that I have known him take four or five hours in writing a single letter, while those around him were despatching a handful. Of course, the letter was worth preserving, as few letters are. It was a beautiful composition, beautifully written out, and such as would be treasured by its recipient, probably for life; but it was produced at great labour to himself. His letter-writing began in times when letters were few and costly, and that may possibly account for a habit he never laid aside, of writing at length and carefully to his friends,—his playful humour, literary and domestic tastes, and broad social and political sympathies, all frequently finding some place and expression in the finely-inscribed, and perhaps, well-crossed page."—Pp. vii—ix.

We cannot too strongly express our approbation of the whole of the Preface of Mr. Joseph Henry Hutton. It is a beautifully genial portrait of a true Christian man. He dwells as tenderly as truly on the opinions and tastes of his late father, whether they coincide with or differ from his own. After describing Dr. Hutton's well-defined course on questions of a politico-ecclesiastical character, he proceeds to remark :

"But if he was, by the strongest political conviction, a Dissenter, there never was a Dissenter who delighted less in the attitude of mind which the word expresses. It was, perhaps, on this very account, that he attached so much importance to the duty of resolute nonconformity. Controversy was always painful to him; to agree, always far more natural than to differ. And there was, therefore, no heroism which he rated more highly, than that of the man who tore himself away from old ties of friendship and affection, for the sake of giving free scope to his perceptions of truth and right."—P. xxv.

The description of Dr. Hutton's theological position amongst Unitarians is, we think, perfectly truthful :

"In philosophy and theology, he was well known among his friends as a Necessarian and a Unitarian of what is called the older school; but none, of either school, ever contended more firmly against the exaggerated stress laid upon such differences of opinion, often at the cost of a spiritual freedom which he held as a thousand times more important. He esteemed the miraculous intervention of God, in behalf of the Gospel of Christ, as essential to the authenticity of the Christian revelation. Latterly, indeed, he was less positive on many points, than he had been earlier in life, and proverbially 'had his doubts' on this, that, and the other question. Still, he clung tenaciously to an 'authoritative' declaration of the truth of Christ's message. His Unitarianism was strong and dear to him, as the religion of the natural and simple reason, as well as being, in his belief, in perfect accordance with Christian teaching. Christian Unitarianism was dearer still, as supplying something more cheering and sustaining, than natural reason could ever grasp with certainty. But he loved not, in his pulpit services, to enter on disputed points. He preferred, as I have said, except when distinctly summoned by his duty to enter the field of controversy, to assume the broad ground of Christian faith and sentiment, and address himself to the common understandings and hearts of practical men."—Pp. xxvii, xxviii.

Those who remember the doctrinal sermons of Dr. Hutton, especially

those of his early years at Leeds, will perhaps regret that some of them have not been incorporated in this volume. The sermon in which he discussed the Omniscience of God, and the testimony which that attribute bears to his strict Unity, is admirable alike for its close logical power and its beauty of composition. It exhausts the subject, and presents the Unitarian argument in an impregnable form.

In respect to the selection here given us of Dr. Hutton's sermons, we confess our inability to view them critically. They bring the man before us in all the purity and benignity of his mind and character. As we read, his tones recur to our memory and his countenance is once more a reality to us. But we do not doubt that to others to whom these sermons will bring no personal associations, they will yet be acceptable. Religious utterances like these, wise yet simple and profoundly earnest, will waken up a response wherever religion pure and undefiled has found a tabernacle in the heart. The sermons entitled "The True Ambition," "The Gradual Acquisition of Moral Strength by Moral Fidelity," and "Impulsive Rectitude and a Retrospective Conscience," are admirable specimens of moral and Christian preaching. More eloquent things are to be found even in this volume, but none that will bear more repeated reading or will give a richer spiritual return.

---

*History of Protestant Nonconformity in Wales, from its Rise to the Present Time.* By Thos. Rees. 8vo. Pp. 512. London—John Snow. 1861.

THE history of Welsh Nonconformity is the most important chapter of the history of religion in Wales. Three centuries ago, the religious condition of the people of the Principality was degraded in the extreme, resembling that to be found in the more secluded and neglected parts of England, where, at a distance from the humanizing influence of books and traffic and improving social intercourse with persons of education, ignorance and barbarism worked their will on religion and morals. After the Reformation had dawned in England, Wales continued under the thickest darkness of Popery. The church livings and even the bishoprics were shamelessly jobbed,—e.g. :

"Dr. William Hughes, bishop of St. Asaph, was accused, in the year 1587, of misgoverning his diocese, and of tolerating the most disgraceful abuses. When the case was inquired into, it was found that the bishop himself held sixteen rich livings in *commendam*; that most of the great livings were in the possession of persons who lived out of the country; that one person, that had two of the greatest livings in the diocese, boarded in an ale-house; and that only three preachers resided upon their livings."—Pp. 4, 5.

Even in 1641, it was alleged in a petition to Parliament that there were scarcely as many conscientious and constant preachers in Wales as there were counties. But few as the preachers of the gospel were, their number was diminished and their efficiency hindered by persecution. The bishops took no pains to promote a knowledge of the Reformed faith amongst the people of Wales, and discouraged and punished those that were more zealous than themselves. Nearly a century after the Reformation, no Bibles were to be found in the cottages of the peasantry. They who cared to read them had to go to the cathedrals and parish churches to see them.

The history of the emancipation of Wales from its spiritual degrada-

tion is now for the first time systematically told in the volume before us. The work of Mr. Rees (an orthodox Dissenting minister of the county of Monmouth) is entitled to a respectful reception. The difficulties in its execution were very great. Few had preceded him in the task, and scanty were the materials they left to his hands. In Calamy's great work, the notices of the ejected ministers of Wales are slight,—often a name is all that is told. Dr. Richards, of Lynn, did something to improve upon Calamy in his *Cambro-British Biography*. But from the scarcity of books, and the non-existence of MSS. relating to the times of the fathers of Nonconformity in Wales, the task of Mr. Rees was a hard one, as any one can tell who has had to make his tale of bricks with no supply of straw. He has done his work in an honest spirit. His style is sometimes wanting in simplicity and refinement; now and then his researches have not been as perfect as with access to good old libraries they might have been; and here and there, possibly, his conclusions have been somewhat influenced by his theological opinions. But we willingly concede that he has striven to write a true history; and when we remember that the historian lives two centuries after the most interesting of the events he has to describe, we need not wonder that his materials are sometimes disappointingly scanty, but may be thankful that they are as full as they are.

The work is divided into seven chapters. In the introductory chapter, Mr. Rees describes the religious condition of Wales for more than a century before it was evangelized. He gives a very interesting sketch of the labours of the men who first offered pure religious instruction to his countrymen. The first portion of the word of God printed in the Welsh tongue was the work of Sir John Price, LL.D. He translated the Lord's Prayer, the Ten Commandments and the Creed. The date assigned by Mr. Rees to this publication is 1546. Anthony Wood gives a rather later date, 1555. Mr. Rees might, indeed, by a reference to Anthony Wood (*Athen. Oxon.*, I. 216—218), have greatly enlarged his account of Sir John Price. It would have certainly been well for him to mention his treatise, in Latin, on the Eucharist. But the father of the religious literature of Wales is William Salesbury, an Oxford student of the 16th century, who enjoyed the rare distinction of being master of nine languages, and who published, in 1567, a translation into Welsh of the New Testament.

“His style is very stiff, clumsy, and unintelligible, owing, undoubtedly, to the eccentric cast of his mind rather than to his want of learning. During the reign of Queen Mary he resided at a place called Caedu, in the parish of Llansanan, in Denbighshire. His zeal, and literary services to the cause of Protestantism, exposed him to imminent dangers in that bloody reign. For his safety he had in his house a small chamber, curiously contrived, accessible only by climbing inside the chimney. After the publication of the New Testament, Salesbury was engaged on a translation of the Old, and had resided nearly two years at Abergwili, with Bishop Richard Davies, for that object, when, unhappily, they disagreed respecting the meaning and etymology of one word. The one would not give way to the other; they consequently parted, and the work was left unfinished. From this time we have no further account of Salesbury. The time and place of his death are unknown, but his name still lives in the affections of his countrymen, and it will live as long as the Welsh language.”—P. 15.

It would have been well, as qualifying some of his censures of the



Bishops, if Mr. Rees had mentioned that Salesbury translated the New Testament by the command and under the direction of the Welsh Bishops. Strype informs us that the Queen (Elizabeth) granted to Salesbury, in conjunction with John Waley, printer, a seven years' patent for the Bible and Book of Common Prayer, and mentions that the Bishops of Hereford, St. David's, St. Asaph, Bangor and Llandaff, first perused and allowed the translations.

The Dr. Davies with whom Salesbury quarrelled was one of the Marian exiles, and afterwards Bishop successively of St. Asaph and St. David's. Mr. Rees should have specified his share in the translation of the Old Testament, viz., from the beginning of Joshua to the end of 2nd of Samuel. Dr. Wm. Morgan (afterwards Bishop of Llandaff and St. Asaph) completed a Welsh translation of the whole Bible, making use of and correcting the versions of Salesbury and Davies. Mr. Rees does not mention one singular blunder in his version, pointed out in Llewelyn's Historical Account of the Welsh Bible,—*vials of wrath*, he renders *crythan*, i.e. violins. Dr. Morgan was chaplain to Archbishop Whitgift, who had a high opinion of his abilities and encouraged him in his biblical labours. Other facts relating to him Mr. Rees will find in the new volume of Cooper's *Athenæ Cantabrigienses* (II. 393, 394).

To the enthusiastic Penry, the "Pioneer of Welsh Nonconformity" and the martyr, Mr. Rees devotes many pages, but follows Dr. Waddington's well-known Memoir. Dr. Richard Parry published a revised edition of the Welsh Bible in 1620, being assisted in the work by his chaplain, Dr. John Davies.

The last name mentioned in Mr. Rees's first chapter is Rees Prichard, who, if we may trust the testimony of his admirers in the Principality, achieved a kind of literary immortality by turning his sermons into verse. No book, it is said (after the Bible), has been so extensively circulated as Prichard's Poems, collected into a volume and published after his death under the title of "The Morning Star, or the Welshman's Candle."

"His volume is a complete body of doctrinal and practical divinity. The style is simple, sententious, and remarkably vigorous. The sentiments are highly Calvinistic, but without the least tincture of Antinomianism. Several of the most striking verses have long since become national proverbs. The vicar, in describing the moral degradation of his countrymen, and the disgraceful character of the clergy, uses language quite as strong as John Penry; but he wrote in the Welsh tongue, and his compositions were not published till after his death: he thus escaped troubles, which otherwise would most probably have fallen to his lot."—P. 35.

In the next chapter, Mr. Rees describes the rise of Nonconformity about 1633, and carries on the history to the commencement of the civil war. During the eighty years following the Reformation, little had been done in Wales to reclaim the mass of the people from the ignorance into which Popery had plunged and kept them. The men who declined conformity to the ceremonies, and who were the mark of Episcopal persecution, were really the apostles of vital Christianity in Wales. The names of these men are first disclosed to us in Mr. Rees's volume by means of extracts from Laud's annual reports to the King from 1633 to 1640. The first is William Wroth, who was driven from his living at Llanvaches, near Chepstow. In the case of the apostles of Nonconformity, as of the early ministers of the Christian church, the persecution

set on foot by their enemies promoted the cause intended for destruction. Driven from their homes and churches, the confessors went abroad and carried with them the seeds of truth, which they succeeded in planting far and wide. Other eminent Welsh Nonconformist ministers of this period were Walter Cradock, Marmaduke Matthews, Richard Symonds (schoolmaster at Shrewsbury to Richard Baxter), Ambrose Mostyn, Henry Walter, Robert Powell and William Erbury. Of all of these brief memoirs are given. The last named, William Erbury, was a puzzle to his contemporaries, as he is to their historian. Mr. Rees supposes that after a certain time Erbury was under the delusions of insanity. But he was only insane in the same way that theological mystics may be so called. His mysticism never entirely left him; but with all, he was on some subjects lucid and powerful. Nowhere are finer defences to be found of unrestricted religious liberty. On the subject of the Trinity he was certainly heretical. Mr. Wallace properly classed him with the Anti-trinitarian divines. Passages may be adduced also from his published works, shewing that he was equally free from the orthodoxy of his day on the capital points of the death of Christ, and the connection between faith and justification. We have not sufficient space at present to discuss the subject with Mr. Rees, but propose at some future time to give some extracts from Erbury's writings illustrative of his opinions.

We will conclude our present notice of Mr. Rees's volume with a portion of his account of Mr. Erbury, intending to notice other portions of the work in a future No.

" Amongst Mr. Wroth's contemporaries and fellow-labourers, the first place belongs to WILLIAM ERBURY, or Erbery, B.A., in point of seniority, if not on account of his usefulness and eminence. This good man was born in the parish of Roath, near Cardiff, in the year 1604. He was educated at Brasenose College, Oxford. After completing his course, and taking his degree at the University, he was episcopally ordained, and commenced his ministry at Newport, Monmouthshire, and afterwards became vicar of St. Mary's, Cardiff. He was ejected from that living in 1638, for refusing to read the Book of Sports, and other Nonconforming practices. The Bishop of Llandaff says that he had left the diocese in peace after his ejection. He then most probably traversed different parts of the Principality as an itinerant preacher. In 1642 he was plundered in Wales by the King's party, and was consequently compelled to flee to England for refuge, where he became a chaplain to a regiment of the Parliament's army. From this time to the time of his death, which occurred in the month of April, 1654, it does not appear that he returned to Wales to settle there, but only occasionally visited it. During these visits he often preached, but not in the regular congregations, or in connection with the recognized ministers. He says that he was not invited or admitted by the ministers to their pulpits, on account of the peculiarity of his views. Mr. Erbery, several years before his death, was visited by a sore affliction, which to some degree deranged his mind. Previous to this, he is said to have been a man of good parts, and an excellent scholar, zealous and successful in his ministry, and particularly grave and religious in his life. He published, from time to time, a vast number of tracts and small pamphlets, twenty-three of which were collected and reprinted, in a quarto volume, by some of the author's admirers, in 1658, entitled 'The Testimony of William Erbery left upon Record.' This volume is of little historical value, but it furnishes ample proofs of the author's piety, fine talents, and, unhappily, his partial mental derangement. Here and there we find in it flashes of wit, and some of the most correct, sublime, and telling ideas, but interspersed with such a mass of religious nonsense, as none but a mentally-deranged man would have penned.

"Mr. Erbery's contemporaries give various and contradictory representations of his sentiments. By some he is said to have been a Socinian; by others, 'one of the chief of the Anabaptists;' while another class gives him the appellation of a 'turbulent Antinomian;' but all these are misrepresentations. His defence before the Committee for Plundered Ministers, at Westminster, March 9th, 1652, sufficiently proves that he was not a Socinian, though his statement of his sentiments on the person and death of Christ is very confused, mystical, and somewhat unintelligible. The numberless remarks on baptism and the Anabaptists, to be met with on almost every page of his works, show that he was as far as the poles are asunder from the views of that party; and his constant inculcation of the necessity of spirituality of mind and holiness of conduct, throughout all his writings, acquits him from the charge of Antinomianism. The truth is, that it would be a difficult task for any one, after reading carefully every line which he wrote, to state in plain words what was his creed, and it is very doubtful whether the good man himself knew what it was. Yet, amidst all his confusions and mystical expressions, it is perfectly plain that he was a strenuous advocate of inward and outward holiness, and as strenuously opposed to the idea of a visible church, the ministry, and the outward ordinances of religion. If it were proper to classify him with any particular party, he must be placed among the Quakers. His views of the ministry, the ordinances, &c., were similar to theirs. He never actually joined them, but his wife did."—Pp. 47—49.

---

*A Brief History of the English Presbyterian Chapel and Congregation at Lydgate, in the Parish of Kirkburton, in the County of York, founded through the Preaching of Ejected Ministers in 1662.* By H. J. Morehouse. 4to, Pp. 19. Huddersfield. 1861.

THIS is a very interesting account (its brevity its only fault) of one of the early rural seats of Presbyterian Nonconformity in the county of York. The congregation at Lydgate was gathered amidst a storm of persecution. Its earliest ministers were the ejected clergy of the district.

"Shortly after the 'ejection' took place, a considerable number of earnest persons in this parish having strong religious impressions, and deeply sympathising with those ministers, met together for worship; but as the laws strictly forbade all such meetings, they were held in great secrecy, and as frequently as those perilous times would permit; and sometimes, for their greater safety, in the night season. The place of their most frequent resort was the house of Godfrey Armitage, of Lydgate, who is stated to have been 'a great friend of Mr. Oliver Heywood.' This house was pulled down a few years ago. It was an ancient structure, built about the reign of Charles I., or somewhat earlier, and was only one storey in height. It was sufficiently large to admit a considerable number of persons, and was entered by a spacious passage which went directly through the building, with a door at each end, where, as tradition states, persons were stationed when meeting together for worship, to watch, lest the King's spies should come upon them at unawares, and prevent their escape. The house, being situated on the knoll of a small hill, commanded a view on every side, and thus afforded the worshippers, in case of alarm, a ready opportunity to disperse."—Pp. 4, 5.

Mr. Morehouse quotes from the Diary of Oliver Heywood an account of some of the dangers to which this brave apostle of Nonconformity was exposed in his visits to the persecuted churches of that wild district.

"On the 13th March, 1684, I went to preach in Kirkburton parish, though the weather was exceedingly unfavourable." "I set out, but found the way very dangerous, for it snow-balled my horse's feet. I resolved to call at Mr. Thorp's, Hopton Hall; but going towards the house, my horse fell, and I lay



I know not how. The same day I had a more wonderful deliverance: for, going in the snow from Mr. Lockwood's, of Blackhouse [in Thurstonland], towards J. Armitage's [of Lydgate], having no track, I missed my way, and got entangled in a wood, among bogs and dangerous precipices. I toiled hard, sometimes riding and sometimes walking on foot, till I was out of breath. It was moonlight; and at last I got to J. A.'s, where I was to preach. When I told him where I had been, he was much astonished, and said I did not know the hazard to which I had been exposed; for the place is so dangerous it is called Sinking-hill [Sinking-wood] by the inhabitants. I preached to about forty persons, on Matthew vi. chap. 33 ver., and went about half a mile, near twelve o'clock, to lodge. The people gave me three shillings and sixpence for my labour. I was well content, and bless God. Now, O my Soul! what improvement doest thou make of these various providences? Our adversaries envy us all such pains, and toil, and hazard, for our dear Lord, and the good of sinners. They enjoy their rich livings, fair parsonages, and fruitful glebes; they step out of their houses into churches, read their easy services, say their eloquent orations, eat the fat and drink the sweet; are companions with gentlemen and peers of the realm; have their thousands a year, making laws for us, and yet think much at our having a poor livelihood, and a little honest work; weeping and wrestling with God and sinners to do good. They call us Schismatics and seditious; they exasperate Magistrates against us, punish, banish, and imprison us; confiscate our goods, excommunicate and censure us, and think and say we are not worthy to live; while we live peaceably, pray for them, and dare challenge them if ever they found fault in us, save in the matter of our God."—Pp. 9, 10.

Some interesting particulars are given of the Conformist vicar of Kirkburton, one Joseph Briggs, whose intercourse with his Presbyterian neighbours was sometimes of a more social and friendly character than was usual in those trying days.

The early Presbyterians of some parts of the West Riding are deserving in one respect of honourable mention. After the Revolution, the steps they took to withstand Romanism were in the direction of popular education. They wisely concluded that this would prove "the best safeguard against Popery and arbitrary power."

The part which the Presbyterians of the northern counties took in the two rebellions of 1715 and 1745, has scarcely received the attention it deserves. We should like to see all the facts collected. The minister at Lydgate during the time of the second rebellion was Mr. William Eden, who afterwards removed to Elland, near Halifax. His name must be added to those of Mr. Turner, of Preston, Mr. Woods, of Chowbent, and Mr. Heywood, of Mansfield, all of whom shewed military ardour in defence of the Hanoverian family.

This narrative is dedicated by its intelligent author to the Rev. John Owen, who, after completing his fifteenth year of pastoral residence at Lydgate, is now, amidst the respectful regrets of his congregation and friends of the West Riding, removing to another scene of ministerial duty in a distant part of the county. He leaves the spacious and renovated chapel and the modern parsonage-house happily unencumbered by debt, monuments of the "deep interest" he has manifested in the welfare of Lydgate and its people.

Mr. Morehouse's History forms part of a larger topographical work just published.

*Psalms, Hymns and Spiritual Songs, for use in the Public Services of the Church of Christ.* Compiled by John R. Beard, D.D., and James C. Street. London—Simpkin and Co.

NOTWITHSTANDING the progressive tendencies of our denomination, there are some things in which we are singularly conservative. As a rule, we do not like new Hymn-books. Attached as we are to the old-fashioned volumes out of which our earliest religious emotions were expressed, we are inclined to look with something like suspicion on all fresh candidates for our favour. Those old-fashioned volumes carry us back to our childhood, when our faith had not been disturbed by doubt nor our souls clouded by sin. They bring up before our mind's eye the large square pews in which our little bodies were prisoned, the solemn services at which we so much wondered, the venerable form of some apostle of truth to whose preaching we tried in vain to listen, and the faces of many loved ones whom we hope to meet again presently in the world of spirits. But though we cling to the past, and are inclined to fancy that the summers were sunnier and the winters merrier when we were young, we should be foolish if we closed our eyes to the changes which are taking place in our denomination. To a more earnest spirit and a more fervent piety, the cold, calm religion, for which we have hitherto been distinguished, is gradually yielding. Having protested for years past, not only in our sermons but in our devotional exercises, against the errors of a so-called orthodoxy, we are beginning to yearn for something more satisfactory to our souls than the dry husks of controversy. We want to praise the Almighty, not only as the God of nature but as the God of grace—to acknowledge Him, not only as the Creator of the universe but as the Father of Jesus Christ—to express our thankfulness for His gift of the Holy Spirit—and to utter ourselves in suitable language, when, on great religious occasions, our congregations are brought together. In many of our older Hymn-books we are conscious of deficiencies which need to be supplied, before they can become adequate expressions of our soul's deep wants. Those Hymn-books appeal to our intellects, but do not touch our hearts. The compositions which they contain are theological discourses rather than earnest supplications, and belong to the regions of Deism rather than to the church of Jesus Christ. It is hardly to be wondered at that some of our young people have turned away from poems which do not meet their spiritual necessities, and have delighted in hymns which, though tinged by a false theology, are expressive of the desire of the soul for the water of everlasting life. A volume containing more than seven hundred well-selected hymns, the collection the title of which appears at the head of this article, comes out at a suitable time. We want words of devotion which will put Christ before us in his right position, and will declare the gratitude which we feel to God for giving him to us. To those who are dissatisfied with our denominational Hymn-books of an elder age, and are unable to utter their religious feelings in the exaggerated language of Watts and Wesley, this collection brings great relief. It meets wants of which men become more conscious as they draw closer to Christ. Free for the most part from compositions to which many Unitarians object, it is suited to the use of those who are unable to adopt either Dr. Kippis's or Mr. Martineau's. Recognizing

Christ in the worship of the Christian church, its general tendency is to put him, not on the throne, but at the right hand of the throne—to make him, not the object of our prayers, but our advocate with the Father. We regret, however, to see in it some hymns that seem to us to be opposed to that worship of the Father on which the editors in their Preface so properly insist. The hymn (247) beginning,

“Father, that in the olive shade!”

ends by an address to Christ that, in our opinion, is contrary to the principles on which the collection professes to be based:

“Thou Saviour! if the stroke must fall,  
Hallow our grief!”

Again, in hymn 263, we read,

“Joy and triumph crown the Saviour,  
*Seated on the throne above:*”

which seems to us to put Jesus Christ in the place of the Father. But we are inclined to believe that these hymns have crept in by some oversight, and that on a revision of the book the editors will reject them. And while we are finding fault, we may express our dissatisfaction with the arrangement of the subjects, which strikes us as somewhat fanciful. Thus hymns intended for the *beginning* of public worship are found in the *middle* of the volume, the inconvenience of which is obvious.

But, notwithstanding a few blemishes, the book is likely to be exceedingly acceptable to converts from Trinitarianism, because it unites theological soundness with religious warmth, and so is free from those difficulties of which converts to Unitarianism have been hitherto painfully conscious. Among our newly-formed missionary congregations we trust that the book will make way. The names of the editors will recommend it to some who, on examining it, will accept it for itself. And though it brings us no nearer to that, as some think, better state of things, when there shall be one Hymn-book, and one Hymn-book only, in the Unitarian church, it may suggest the thought that, by a friendly arrangement among the editors of our different Hymn-books, a better work may be produced than we at present possess,—a work which will be free from the objections urged against existing collections. It is the opinion of some amongst us, that the editing of a Hymn-book intended for general denominational use should not be left to private hands; but that, by the united labours of several persons acting for the body at large and representing the different feelings existing among us, a collection should be prepared which would reconcile differences and command universal acceptance. But until such a collection is produced, we must take the best private Hymn-book that we can get; and because we believe that the “Psalms, Hymns and Spiritual Songs” are Christian as well as Unitarian, and Unitarian as well as Christian, we recommend them to our recently-formed congregations who have not yet provided themselves with a Hymn-book.



## INTELLIGENCE.

OPENING OF THE NEW UNITARIAN CHAPEL  
AT UPPERTHORPE, SHEFFIELD.

In the valuable letter of Rev. Brooke Herford communicated to the Secretary of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association as part of the Annual Report, he said that the prospects of the second Unitarian congregation at St. Philip's, Sheffield, under the care of Rev. J. P. Hopps, were "very hopeful;" adding this statement: "The little preaching-room does not afford scope for any *enlargement* of the congregation actually attending, as it has been overcrowded during the whole period, but the number of those in the district who have become attached to the new cause is constantly increasing: Mr. Hopps by lectures and other means has become known and very popular, and we are only waiting for the completion of the new building to see the result of his labours in a flourishing congregation. During the past year, the two congregations have raised over £1200 for the new chapel, a handsome Gothic building which is to cost £1400 when completed, and to hold from 500 to 600 persons." The chapel thus referred to is now completed, and is a singularly cheerful and convenient place of worship. The site is excellently selected, being elevated and open; and the building, which is of stone, Gothic, of the early English, is very neat. It is in Addy Street, and, owing to the rapid enlargement of the town in that locality, will soon become the centre of a large population. The interior is light and airy, the principal timbers of the roof are open, and the other parts, together with the walls, are appropriately finished in a light colour. The pews are all open and stained oak. The platform is ornamented in the front, and a cross is conspicuously exhibited, as also one of stone on the outside, over the entrance. The two east windows are of beautifully stained glass, while the others are partly of stained and partly of plain glass. Over the western doorway there is a gallery, intended for the children; and at the opposite end, behind the platform, a recessed gallery for the choir, where, provisionally, a small organ is placed. The chapel is estimated to seat about 500, and has cost £1450, Mr. John Frith being the architect. In the matter of its cost, the new chapel is remarkable. Such a building in many of our towns would not have been reared for much less than £3000. The progress of the work has been watched by the neighbours with much interest.

On the opening day, the cottagers around freely opened their doors and offered hospitable civilities to the numerous strangers in attendance,—a pleasant proof that a kindly feeling exists towards the minister and his flock of the new chapel. The work has been rapidly executed, as the ceremony of the laying of the foundation-stone (a work appropriately done by Miss Shore, of Meersbrook) took place as late as October 15, 1860. Another remarkable feature in the history of this chapel is, that its cost has been liberally provided by the friends of the Unitarian cause in Sheffield, aided a little by contributions from distant friends.

The opening day was Wednesday, July 17, and although a great agricultural meeting at Leeds kept away many friends, the attendance was large and respectable. Among those present were the principal members of the older congregation, including Mr. Hunter, the Master Cutler; Mr. Otley Shore, of Ashbourn; Mr. Joseph Lupton, of Leeds; Mr. Clennell, of Hackney; Mr. England, of Huddersfield. The ministers present were, Rev. J. P. Hopps, the pastor; Rev. Brooke Herford; Rev. Charles Beard, of Gee Cross; Rev. R. B. Aspland (who with his colleague, Mr. Clennell, attended as a deputation from the British and Foreign Unitarian Association); Rev. Rees Lloyd, of Belper; Rev. J. W. Smith, of Lincoln; Rev. W. Blazeby, of Rotherham; Rev. Francis Bishop, of Chesterfield; and Rev. M. A. Moon, of Stannington. The service commenced with a hymn composed for the occasion by Mr. Bramley, of Sheffield.

O Lord of earth and heav'n above !  
Fountain of mercy, truth, and love ;  
To Thee, who didst all things create,  
This Temple now we dedicate.

Free as Thy grace its courts shall be,  
Wide as Thy love its charity ;  
Our bond of union Christ alone,  
Head of the Church and Corner-stone.

Vouchsafe, O Lord ! our work to bless ;  
Crown it, we pray, with rich success :  
May thousands here, both young and old,  
Be gathered to the Saviour's fold !

Here may the Gospel's sacred page  
Send heavenly light from age to age,  
And clearly to each waiting heart  
Its deep consoling truths impart.

Here too, when anxious cares assail,  
Or gloomy doubts and fears prevail,  
May weary souls for solace fly,  
And find the rest for which they sigh.

And oh ! at last, great God of grace,  
May all who here have sought Thy face,  
In realms above Thy glory see,  
Thy name adore eternally !

The devotional service was conducted with impressive simplicity and feeling by Rev. J. Page Hopps. The sermon of consecration was preached by Rev. Charles Beard, of Gee Cross, and was in every respect worthy of its author and the occasion. After a very striking exordium, in which the building was solemnly dedicated to its various Christian uses, Mr. Beard took as his text John i. 14 and Mark xii. 37, and thence discoursed on the characteristics of the church which would meet the intellectual and moral and spiritual wants of the common people, and the services of which they would gladly hear. At the close of the sermon a collection was made, and although the town of Sheffield is suffering from an unprecedentedly severe depression of trade, and thousands of workmen are wandering about the streets unemployed, the sum of £56 was contributed. Immediately after the service preparations were made for a social gathering within the walls. A spacious tent, erected on what will be the site of the school buildings, enabled the managers of the day's proceedings to get up in a very short space of time an excellent tea, which was supplied to the visitors and friends in the chapel. About 400 persons partook of the refreshment.—The duties of the chair were performed by Mr. Thomas Jessop. In opening the proceedings, he gave a sketch of the growth and rise of the congregation and chapel, and paid a well-deserved tribute to the Christian zeal of Rev. Brooke Herford, who had originated the movement now crowned with such unexpected success. To Mr. Page Hopps, the pastor of the new society, who had thus far so admirably carried out the scheme, a becoming tribute was also paid. The building itself, and the talent and liberality of the architect, were also mentioned with warm praise. In conclusion, the Chairman pointed out the one deficiency in their work, suitable school buildings, the proper accompaniment of such a chapel. Though postponed from financial considerations, they were not forgotten. Land was secured sufficient for this important supplement to the church. The words of congratulation suitable to the occasion were spoken by Mr. Joseph Lupton, of Leeds, seconded by Mr. Moon, of Stannington, and supported by Mr. Brooke Herford. Mr. Lupton, while admiring the manly zeal of the Sheffield Unitarians, expressed his regret that they had in one point got in advance of the Unitarians of

Leeds. Mr. Moon paid a glowing tribute to the ability, fearlessness and honesty of Mr. Hopps, and vindicated at some length the large use of architectural symbols which had entered into the construction of the new chapel.

In supporting the prayer of the resolution for the prosperity of the Upperthorpe chapel, Mr. Herford said—I believe that it will prosper. It deserves to prosper. We have built a church perfectly free. Some of their neighbours in Sheffield might perhaps ask, “Why do you build it? why are you not satisfied with all the churches and chapels there are? why cannot you go along with those who hold the old doctrines of Christianity, and join those churches?” This has been said. I have been asked, “Why do you go and stand alone in the world in your little miserable regiment of a sect, when you may join in with the whole army of the Church?” The answer is plain. We have a truth which we believe to be the truth of God, and which we are bound to do what we can to spread. We have something else besides truth. We have liberty, which no other church has. And it is because we wish to build up a church for the truth in the spirit and upon the corner-stone of liberty, that we hold the position of isolation among other Christian bodies, and we shall hold to it until they will be willing to have us in their pale. Though in this day there are very few left of what are called religious disabilities, although almost the last rag of intolerance has been taken away, I feel that the position we hold in the world as Unitarian Christians makes it, to some extent, a brave thing for men to stand together and hold to it in the face of the rest of society. I was lately, whilst on a preaching visit to the south of England, able to look round some of our great cathedrals, and I could not help thinking why is it that we have to look upon these noble structures as buildings alien to ourselves; why is it that, however truly Christian we may be striving to be, we are strangers and aliens in these great cathedrals where our fathers worshiped. I am not ashamed to acknowledge that I for one do feel when I pass the churches of our land the question arise in my mind, why have these churches, which were built for the people of this land, gone over to one of its sects? And I feel a sense of isolation, and that it requires still a little courage to stand patiently by our position; to be willing to worship in our humble chapels; to have the finger of scorn pointed at us; and dare to brave calumny and the whispered insinuation of the sects. It certainly does need a religious fidelity to principle to hold by

our position. We cannot pay the price of admission into these churches. There are many men in the Church of England in these days, as we know of late, who preach a Christianity very little different from our own. While the liberal thinkers in the Church are content to utter new things and true things in the old words taken in other than the common sense, we feel that we dare not tamper with the truth, and must tell what we believe to be Christ's truth and God's truth in the simplest words we can find. It is in this spirit we have reared this church.

The resolution was acknowledged by Mr. Hopps in a very interesting speech, and in conclusion he proposed a vote expressive of the feelings of the congregation to Mr. Beard for his admirable sermon. The resolution, having been seconded by Mr. Alderman Jackson, was acknowledged by Mr. Beard, who afterwards spoke on the claims to support of the Unitarian Association, and explained the grounds on which he gave it his warm support.—The resolution proposed by Mr. Beard was seconded by Mr. Offley Shore.—The Secretaries of the Association, Rev. R. Brook Aspland and Mr. J. E. Clennell explained the objects and modes of operation at home and abroad adopted by the Association, and offered to the new congregation their congratulations on the happy event of the day, and stated the reasons why the Committee felt it an imperative duty to send down a deputation. Other addresses were given by Mr. Hobson, Mr. Wm. Fisher, Jun., Mr. Beckett and Mr. Ryalls, and then the meeting closed in the usual manner, all present grateful for the varied pleasures of the day.

The opening services were continued on Sunday, July 21st, when two admirable and powerful sermons were preached by the Rev. Wm. Forster, of Kentish Town. The congregations were excellent on both occasions; in the evening the chapel being completely filled. The collections for the day amounted to nearly £25.

What has been done at Sheffield may be done elsewhere. A strong and flourishing congregation may send a promising swarm to another district and occasion no enduring sense of loss to the parent hive. This second Sheffield chapel is not a mere missionary station. The zealous friends of the older chapel will be best pleased, and will feel themselves most rewarded, if the younger society at once achieves its independence.

The thanks of the Unitarian public are due to Mr. Brooke Herford for originating this movement, important in itself, but we hope still more important in its possible

results, as shewing the way in which our Unitarian societies may, at least in our larger towns, be multiplied in number and strengthened in zealous co-operation.

#### ANNUAL EXAMINATION—MANCHESTER NEW COLLEGE.

The examination was held in the last week of June, and was, we believe (for we were prevented by other public engagements from attending it, except for a few hours on the first day), considered satisfactory. We borrow from the report in the *Unitarian Herald* of June 29, some particulars:

“The present number of divinity students in the College is 18, which is more than there have been for a long period. Three of them were obliged by ill health to be absent from the examination. This was held in University Hall, Gordon Square, on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday last, from half-past nine to five o'clock each day. The following gentlemen were present during the whole or part of the proceedings: Thomas Ainsworth, Esq., President; Rev. John Kenrick and Rev. Wm. Gaskell, Visitors; the Principal, Rev. J. J. Tayler; Professor Martineau and Russell Martineau; R. D. Darbshire, Esq., and the Rev. C. Beard, Secretaries; Revds. Thomas Madge, J. P. Malleson, E. Higginson, J. Gow, L. Lewis, J. P. Ham, T. Marshall, J. Gordon, J. Colston, H. Hutton, J. Fisher, Wm. H. Herford, R. Shaen, C. B. Upton and Dr. Sadler; Messrs. W. D. Jeremy, Mark Phillips, Warren, James Heywood, S. Sharpe, W. Case, Alderman Clarke Lawrence, E. Bowman, E. Enfield, R. Aspden, W. N. Coupland, H. C. Robinson and S. Shaen. The subjects in which the students were examined were Mathematics, Hebrew, Latin and Greek, Mental Philosophy, Ethics, Christian Truths and Evidences, Biblical Archaeology, Ecclesiastical History, History of Doctrine, Introduction to the New Testament and the Interpretation of it. It would occupy too much of our space to give details of the examination in each of these branches of study. It will be seen how wide the range of instruction is; and we do not believe that so thorough and systematic a training is given in any other theological institution in the kingdom. The students shewed that they had faithfully availed themselves of the advantages offered to them, and, generally speaking, acquitted themselves well. Six of them delivered sermons in the Common Hall, which were characterized by earnestness of spirit, and likewise displayed considerable power of composition.



“At the close of the examination, a considerable number of gentlemen, besides those before mentioned, and also a number of ladies, assembled in the Common Hall, when Rev. Thomas Madge, for so many years the honoured minister of Essex-Street chapel, and the oldest survivor, we believe, of the race of York students, delivered, with no marks of failing strength, in his usually clear and telling manner, an excellent address.”

For the address we refer our readers to the first department of this Magazine. A soirée, very numerous attended, was held the following evening in University Hall. At the Trustees' meeting, some conversation took place respecting the health of the students, and the absolute necessity of diminishing the severity of the intellectual toil demanded from them. We sincerely hope that the authorities in the University of London and in our Colleges will take immediate steps for easing the severity of the studies of the alumni of their respective institutions. Among the candidates for admission to the College is a son of Rev. Charles Wicksteed. The Unitarian public will hear with satisfaction that one bearing this name of promise is preparing himself for the duties of the pulpit.

#### EASTERN UNITARIAN CHRISTIAN SOCIETY.

This association was formed at Norwich in the year 1813, on the very day that Mr. William Smith's Bill for the relief of Unitarians from legal penalties became law. On that occasion the late Rev. Robt. Aspland was the preacher, and the sermon delivered by him formed one of Three Sermons published soon after in a duodecimo volume. At the anniversary this year, held at Norwich, on Wednesday, June 26, and Thursday, June 27, the sermons were preached by Rev. R. B. Aspland, of Hackney, and Rev. Brooke Herford, of Sheffield; and a tea-meeting followed the service on the earlier day, and a collation, the service and business meeting on the second day. There was the usual gathering of ministers of the eastern counties, and Mr. David Martineau, Mr. Alfred Lawrence and the Secretary, attended as a deputation from the British and Foreign Unitarian Association. The proceedings were generally of an interesting and satisfactory character. At the business meeting the rules of the Society were modified, to enable the Committee to undertake missionary duties. Mr. Robert Aspland, of Wicken, attended to ask the attention of the Society to the case of Soham, where, by the death of the late lamented Rev. W. Clack, the little flock is left without a shepherd. The

hope was expressed that, aided by the Unitarian Association, the ministers of the eastern counties might arrange a series of services at Soham, with a view of keeping together the congregation. Admirable addresses were delivered at the tea-party by Rev. D. Davis, Rev. Brooke Herford, Mr. Dowson, Rev. Mr. Ellis, of Diss, the friends from London, &c. &c. At the collation, the assembled friends paid a tribute of respect to Rev. Henry Squire, who had on the previous Sunday preached his farewell sermon to the congregation at Yarmouth, to which he had ministered for many years. — The friends at Norwich opened their houses to visitors from a distance with true Christian hospitality. The meeting was felt from beginning to end to be refreshing and useful. The Society was invited to Lynn and Ipswich next year, and decided (while cordially welcoming Mr. Reid, the minister recently settled at Lynn, as a new member) to go to Ipswich. The proceedings at this meeting deserve being reported in fuller detail; but as they have already been given in both the *Herald* and the *Inquirer*, we must, with our limited space, be contented to give this brief notice.

#### UNITARIANISM IN CALCUTTA.

The following letter from Sergeant-Major Cress has just come to hand, and will be read with interest by those who recently heard Joguth Gangooly speak of the mighty power of caste prejudices and abuses.

UNITARIAN MISSION-HOUSE,  
85, Dhurruntollah, Calcutta,  
June 7th, 1861.

Rev. Sir,—No doubt you will be expecting a few words respecting the Indian mission, and I at this time most cheerfully fulfil, as far as possible, your expectations. If this mission was considered prosperous before, it may now be looked upon as doubly so. I cannot tell you of crowds flocking to hear the word of God as expounded by us. I cannot point out a number of youthful converts and say, “Behold I and the children which God hath given me.” I cannot tell you of men and women casting their idols to the bats and turning to the living God. No! Some who pretended to be friends to Christianity have been probed and found the veriest hypocrites. Neither Inor Joguth have tampered or compromised the matter with such. Just fancy men coming here calling themselves Unitarian Christians, and eating a good meal of beef, mutton, fowl or anything else which might be set before them, returning home and pretending that they have never eaten anything which possessed

animal life. Shall I call these converts? Never! Shall I tell them, Go on; you have the truth and light, and although you do not "come out," you can serve God where you are? Never! The Christ is "the truth" of God, and whoever is ashamed of him before men, of them will the Christ be ashamed before his Father. I say such blind hypocrisy is a disgrace to any man or to any mission who would encourage it.

If they are so fond of beef, let them throw off their disguise and deceit and become Christians (for they say to become a Christian is to eat beef and drink wine). If they will not embrace Christianity, but still hug that monster caste, then let them not play the hypocrite and liar, telling their friends they are Brahmins, and telling Europeans they are Christians. Truly they are fond of the "loaves and fishes." But I have better news for you just now. There are two subjects which serve as points of attraction in Calcutta just now—the Relief Fund for the north-western provinces of Bengal, and the return of my companion, Joguth Gangooly. Many come to inquire now who never came before, and some who used to come will, I believe, return no more unless God is pleased to strike home their convictions of being two-faced hypocrites. Poor Joguth! he knew a great deal about caste when he left this for America; but he has learnt since his return that he knew nothing or less than nothing about it. It has done him an immense deal of good. Truly God makes all things work together for good to those who love Him; and, on the contrary, wicked and plotting men in their ambitious zeal do often overstep the mark. After Joguth's return to India he visited his mother. The Brahmin priests heard thereof, and demanded a large sum of money from his mother for allowing *her son* into *her house*, and threatened to make her an outcast if she allowed Joguth there again. I believe Joguth was inclined to pay them (the Brahmins) some money on his mother's account; but when they found such to be the case, they doubled the

amount, and would by no means permit Joguth to enter his mother's house although the money should be paid, and this has stirred up Joguth's soul and body. Caste meets with no mercy at his hands now, and I believe that the unnatural demands of the Brahmins will be of the greatest good both to Joguth personally and to this mission. It gives Joguth rich materials to work with. Who could forbear to sympathize with a child forbidden to enter his mother's roof? We English and Americans can but little understand the evils of caste. Some good men say, until learned Brahmin priests are converted, no good can be done; but on what grounds this opinion is formed, my weak brain cannot discover. Such an opinion is not, I think, borne out by past experience. Jesus is our example, and we know amongst whom he was most frequently found. True, when Constantine professed himself a Christian, he brought the world with him, and a pretty church he made of it, such as we wish not to see in India. Nay, nay, take away the people from the priests, and you take away their money, the loss of which only will ever make a Brahmin stop to consider whether he is right or wrong. It has been the same in Ireland. The Roman Catholic priests cared not until the people began to leave in thousands; then they themselves were led to inquire, wherein have we erred?

The other point, relief from England, will no doubt shew many that there is a reality, a power in Christianity unknown amongst any caste.

The school is getting on well. The 1000 rupees' donation from Government were drawn and deposited in the Oriental Bank on the 29th ult. I am employed from six to seven Eurasian class book-keeping, and from seven to eight a.m. with a native class ditto. I am engaged with the school from ten to three, and have an evening class from eight to nine p.m.

Longing to hear from you, I am, Rev. Sir, your humble and devoted servant,

CHARLES CRESS.

To Rev. R. B. Aspland.

## OBITUARY.

June 7, at Pendleton, Manchester, aged 73 years, ALCROFT PHILLIPS, Esq.

June 12, at Bridgwater, aged 52 years, MR. WILLIAM BADGER, a zealous friend of the Unitarian cause.

June 12, at Liverpool, ALFRED WILLCOX, youngest son of Mr. James ALSOP.

June 13, at Pilsworth, near Bury, aged 75 years, MR. WILLIAM NUTTALL.

June 15, at Southport, aged 69 years, MR. SAMUEL FOX, formerly of Sheffield.

June 17, at Ilminster, BERTHA, the second daughter of John BAKER, Esq., solicitor, of that town, at the age of 23 years.



Her family and the society she adorned have to bear a heavy loss in her departure from among them; for she was singularly beloved as well as greatly esteemed by those who enjoyed the best opportunities of knowing her worth. She was a winning example of what her sex may be in the pure simplicity of its virtues. United to great principles, there was much tenderness of heart,—to an uncompromising sense of right, an affectionate devotion to those who came within the sphere of her service. Her religious impressions were strong and unusually active for one so youthful, and over all these and their kindred virtues such a gentleness and modesty were spread as served, not to hide, indeed, but to render them more simply beautiful in the eyes of those who beheld them through the veil. Of all this she herself was unconscious. Her young life was not a study and an art, but a free and native expression of those just principles which had been instilled into her mind even from her infancy, and of those religious impressions which home discipline had been constantly and happily fixing there.

The premature departure of one so eminently fitted by education and character to benefit her sex, is one of the problems which cannot easily be solved. In the best sense of the word an ornament of it, what a lovely example would have constantly presented itself to her companions and friends! They would have learnt from her, herself unaware the while, how beautiful feminine purity is—how naturally a sweet disposition, gentleness of heart and firmness in the right, combine in the same moral being; and they would have been drawn by the lovable attractions which surrounded her, to an imitation of what the mind tacitly approved and the heart welcomed with delight.

It has pleased God to ordain otherwise, and to make the home she adorned the abode of sorrow. But that sorrow is tempered by resignation and Christian hope; the record of her goodness will also serve to soothe it; and the example of virtues early matured and then borne away to raise successive fruits in a holier clime, will surely not be lost to the many whose affections she had won.

June 19, very suddenly, aged 59 years, ELIZABETH, wife of Mr. Peter UNSWORTH, of Tyldesley.

June 20, at West Bromwich, aged 38 years, after a few days' illness, Mr. JACOB RYLEY, a zealous and respected teacher in the Unitarian Sunday-school at West Bromwich.

July 2, at the residence of T. H. Armstrong, Esq., Dalkey, co. Dublin, JOHN GRIMSHAW, Esq., of High Bank, Gorton, a magistrate and deputy-lieutenant for the county of Lancaster.

July 8, at Horsham, aged 65, Rev. R. ASHDOWNE, for thirty years the minister of the Unitarian Baptist congregation of that place.

July 9, at Oldham, suddenly, in the 68th year of his age, the Rev. THOMAS CROMPTON HOLLAND, formerly of Loughborough, of the Unitarian congregation at which place he was upwards of thirty years the minister.

July 14, at the house of her brother, Rev. Dr. Sadler, of Hampstead, ELIZABETH, third daughter of the late Rev. THOS. SADLER, of Horsham.

## MARRIAGES.

June 21, at Chowbent, by Rev. M. C. Frankland, Mr. PETER COCKER to Miss MARY ANN LITTLEWOOD, both of Leigh.

June 22, at Dean-Row chapel, Wilmslow, by Rev. John Colston, Mr. THOMAS SCHOFIELD to MARY, only daughter of Mr. John HANKINSON, of Dean Row, Cheshire.

June 26, at Gorton chapel, by Rev. G. H. Wells, M.A., Mr. WILLIAM DAVIS, of Manchester, to MARY ISABELLA, eldest daughter of the late J. HAMFSON, Esq., of Openshaw.

June 26, at Knotty-Ash church, by Rev. W. J. Newenham, HENRY ARTHUR, eldest son of Samuel BRIGHT, Esq., of Sand Heys,

West Derby, to MARY ELIZABETH, eldest daughter of S. H. THOMPSON, Esq., of Thingwall, near Liverpool.

June 26, at Stand chapel, by Rev. John Cropper, M.A., Mr. J. T. SIMPSON, of Bolton, to ELIZA, only daughter of Mr. Samuel TAYLOR, Old Hall, Whitefield.

July 15, at the Old chapel, Dukinfield, by Rev. Henry Green, M.A., of Knutsford, Mr. JAS. BUCKLEY to Miss BETTY BROOKSHAW, both of Ashton-under-Lyne.

July 20, at Earl-Street chapel, Maidstone, by Rev. R. E. B. Maclellan, EDWIN MARRIOTT to ANNIE CATHERINE MATHEWS, both of Maidstone.